The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

OUR first words must concern the *Quarterly* and its future. From time to time during his editorship Dr. Peel took his readers into his confidence and explained that finances were generally precariously balanced between profit and loss. Our readers will not need to be told that costs of production have increased greatly and are still going up, so that there is no hope of even the microscopic profits which the accounts sometimes showed in the past. The directors of the Independent Press did, in fact, come to the conclusion at the end of 1947 that they had no alternative but to increase the price of the *Quarterly* to 3s. 6d. with an annual subscription of 12s. At our request they agreed that this decision should not take effect for a year, and accordingly there will be no change of price during 1948 unless entirely unforeseen circumstances arise. This has been made possible only by the granting of a subsidy, but the *Quarterly* is not in the fortunate position of one or two of its contemporaries which can draw permanently on available funds, and there is no reason to think that the subsidy can be repeated. In asking that the raising of the price should be postponed we staked our faith on our readers and on the denomination generally. It cannot be finally avoided unless there is a substantial increase in the number of subscribers. We receive many appreciations from our readers and we believe this journal is of value to Congregationalism and to the Christian Church generally. If we did not believe that, we should certainly not waste time in editing it. We therefore appeal to all, who believe that the *Quarterly* is worth while, to help us in all possible ways to increase its circulation. Personal recommendation is, of course, the best method of recruiting new subscribers. There are many intelligent and thinking laymen in our Churches who would profit by reading the *Quarterly*, but some of them have probably never even heard of it. We ask ministers to introduce it to them. We have a few spare copies of recent issues which might serve as useful introductions, and we shall be glad to supply these free on application to the Manager of the Independent Press. But many of our ministers are themselves not subscribers, in some cases for the very good reason that half-a-guinea takes a great deal of finding. Laymen will do a real service if they will send us a gift for our "Donors' Account",

which will enable us to send the *Quarterly* to some ministers who really cannot afford to pay for it.

We would also enter another plea for that useful institution, the Church bookstall. We are surprised that so few even of our larger Churches or of those in holiday resorts realize the potential usefulness of a stall, which offers (among other things) well-chosen devotional literature and books on the life and work of the Church. The stall is not a rival to local booksellers, but it does bring Christian literature to the attention of people who certainly would not visit a shop in search of it. And, of course, we bespeak a prominent place in the centre of the stall for *The Congregational Quarterly!* It *will* sell. That has been proved.

One word more. We receive frequent complaints about the method used for fastening together the pages. We are well aware that it is unsatisfactory. It is annoying when the book you are reading persists in trying to shut up. The sheets should, of course, be sewn together—as formerly they were. Unfortunately the printer's machinery for that kind of work was destroyed in the blitz, but we are glad to say there is every hope that in the near future the necessary plant will be installed to reintroduce the pre-war method of sewing the *Quarterly*. There is even hope that this present issue will be thread sewn instead of wire stitched!

* * *

THE death of Lord Rayleigh recently reminded us that in August 1938 we had cut out of *The Times* a report of his presidential address to the British Association. A considerable part of his speech was a defence of scientists against the charge that they had been responsible for a great deal of the world's miseries because, by their discoveries, they had enabled man to make warfare more horrible and destructive. We wondered how it would read in the light of all that has happened since 1938. Lord Rayleigh said, "I believe that the whole idea that scientific men are specially responsible is a delusion born of imperfect knowledge of the real course of the process of discovery". Scientists, he contended, are urged on by the desire to explore the unknown, and cannot be deterred by possible contingent results, which may not be, and generally are not, fully apparent till long after the death of the explorer. He gave many examples in support of his thesis, and showed that explosives, substances used in the preparation of poison gases, and thermite were not discovered in a search for more frightful weapons of war:

> In the case of glycerine, Sobrero obtained in 1846 the highly explosive liquid called nitro-glycerine. He meant no harm and, in fact, his discovery lay dormant for many years until Nobel turned his attention to the matter in 1863 and showed how by mixing nitro-glycerine with other substances solid explosives

could be made which admitted of safe handling. Dynamite was one of them. They proved invaluable in the arts of peace. . . .

Coming next to poison gas . . . During the Great War chlorine was used on a large scale. I need hardly insist that chlorine was not isolated by chemists for this purpose. It was discovered 140 years before as a step in the inquiry into the nature of common salt. . . .

Again, there is the terror of thermite incendiary bombs, spreading fire broadcast throughout great cities. The notion is sometimes encountered that thermite was invented for this purpose. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I first made acquaintance with it myself in 1901 by hearing a lecture at the Royal Institution by the late Sir William Roberts Austen on "Metals as Fuel". . . . I venture to say that it never occurred to him or to any of his hearers that thermite had any application in war.

If Lord Rayleigh had been speaking ten years later he would doubtless have added, with equal truth, that Lord Rutherford and the pioneers in atomic research did not pursue their inquiries in order that one day a bomb should be dropped on Hiroshima. Like Sobrero's their researches can "prove invaluable in the arts of peace". But because we must acquit scientists who cannot be expected to foresee the *remote* use to which their discoveries will be put, we are not obliged to relieve from all responsibility those who know well enough the *immediate* object of their work. Atomic bombs could never have been produced without the co-operation of scientists, nor, presumably, could they be made now—certainly not bigger and better ones—if the experts refused their aid. The public utterances of men, who were instrumental in providing the first bombs and who are still on the job, sometimes betray a sense of guilt. They exhort us to secure the control of atomic energy before it is too late. But why do they not say that they will have nothing more to do with the production of bombs? (The same sort of question might, of course, be put to other scientists reputed to be engaged on even more ghastly methods of warfare.) Nobody could foretell what effect such a declaration would have on the scientists of the U.S.S.R., who may, or may not, already have all the secrets in their possession. The international situation would hardly be worsened or the possibility of war increased. There is little doubt that fear is one element in Russian intransigeance, and the renunciation of atomic warfare would decrease the fear without creating the delusion that the democracies have "gone soft". The Church is continually belaboured (and not least by some scientists) for its failures and for refusing to shoulder its responsibilities. Perhaps the Church might be allowed to remind scientists of their

responsibilities and to suggest that there are limits to the validity of the pleas, "We meant no harm" and "We didn't know".

* * *

It has been said that by reason of the variety of his skills the first-rate agricultural worker can stake a fair claim to pre-eminence over all other craftsmen. A glance at the table of contents of the Rev. C. K. Forder's *The Parish Priest at Work* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) suggests that he has a serious rival in the efficient Anglican parson. The book, by the way, runs into 404 pages of excellent paper, and it must surely have been subsidized—money well spent in an excellent cause.

If there is any aspect of the Anglican priest's work not touched upon in this book we cannot conceive what it is, and we hope for his sake that there is none! In reading the book we inevitably compared and contrasted the lot of the Anglican priest with that of his Congregational brother, and we concluded that the Anglican is not in all respects to be envied. A Congregational minister would surely reckon himself unfortunate if he found himself encumbered with such a mass of administrative details as the priest must apparently expect as a matter of course even in a well-run parish. We get the impression from this book that, generally speaking, the Anglican laity are not so ready to work and to accept responsibility as the people in our Churches. On the other hand, the life of the priest is perhaps in some ways simplified by the amount of authority vested in him. He can apparently do a good many things off his own bat which he would certainly not get away with in a Congregational Church. Mr. Forder suggests, for example, that in planning the work of the Church the incumbent will decide what societies shall function, and will hand to the organizers of them polite notes informing them which are to be the nights for their meetings. We suspect there would be some fun at the next Church-meeting if a Congregational minister decided to reshuffle the organizations without a by-your-leave to anybody!

There is, of course, much in the book that is applicable only to the Anglican Church and there are striking differences of emphasis—the preparation and delivery of sermons, for example, are disposed of in four pages. But Mr. Forder has much to say which is of value to a minister of any denomination, and some of us might profit (let us sadly confess it!) by the detailed instructions he gives for the application of office routine in the shape of adequate filing systems and so on, and for the greater use of method in our work.

Mr. Forder's bibliographies suggest that, except on the subject of preaching, more has been written on *pastoralia* for the Anglican priest than for the Free Church minister—though this impression may betray our ignorance of available literature. Assuming it to be

well founded, we would throw out the hint that an experienced minister, who would write a comparable *vade mecum* for Congregationalists, would earn the gratitude of his younger brethren, but not of them alone.

* * *

THE Secretary of a Marriage Guidance Council, with which we are associated, was recently sub-pœnaed as a witness in a divorce case. He interviewed counsel for the petitioner and told him that, even if called, he would refuse to give evidence because his work would become impossible if it were known that he divulged information given him in the strictest confidence. Counsel replied that he would, nevertheless, be called if required. He was not, as it happened, put into the witness-box, but, if he had been, he would have had no protection except the clemency of the judge, who could have committed him to prison for contempt of court and kept him there until his contempt was purged—which, in theory, would have been for the rest of his life if he had persisted in his refusal to give the information required. We have thought it worth while to call attention to this incident because many of our readers are associated with the work of Marriage Guidance Councils and this issue will have to be fought out. Quite apart from that, any minister may find himself in the same position with regard to confidences which he receives in the course of his ordinary pastoral work, and many are hazy as to the legal position. Some suppose that they would be "privileged", which is pure illusion.

We will quote from Halsbury's *Laws of England*:

> Confidential communications, oral or written, passing between a client and his legal advisers, *i.e.* solicitors or counsel are . . . if made for the purpose of obtaining legal advice, privileged from disclosure. Neither the client nor the legal adviser can be compelled to disclose such communications. The communications to be privileged must have been made to or by the legal adviser in his professional capacity. . . .
>
> Confidential communications other than those passing between a client and his legal adviser are not privileged from disclosure.[1].

That means that any person whatsoever, with the exception of a lawyer acting in his legal capacity, can be compelled to disclose confidential communications. There is a quite erroneous notion that doctors are privileged. So far is that from the truth that the notices posted all over the place, giving assurance that sufferers from venereal disease will be treated at clinics in conditions of the strictest secrecy, promise more than can be guaranteed.

A medical man, who in the course of treating a patient under

1 Vol. 13 (2nd ed.), pp. 725f.

COLLEGE LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

> the national scheme for V.D. ascertains that the patient is suffering from such a disease, may be compelled to give evidence to that effect, although the statutory regulations to the scheme enjoin absolute secrecy on the medical man[2].

No minister has any protection. In spite of the fact that the Roman Catholic Church punishes a priest who reveals what he has heard in the Confessional, the law may require him to divulge it.

> In Scotland when a prisoner in custody preparing for his trial has confessed his crimes to a clergyman to obtain spiritual advice and comfort, the confession is privileged, but the privilege is not carried so far as to include communications made confidentially to clergymen in the ordinary course of their duty. In England the common law recognises no distinction between clergymen and laymen, but provides that all confessions and other matters, not confided to legal counsel, must be disclosed when required for the purposes of justice. Neither penitential confessions made to the minister or to members of the party's own Church, nor even secrets confided to a R.C. priest in the course of confession are regarded as privileged communications[3].

The Roman Catholic Church has ingeniously tried to find a way out of the difficulty. Mascardus says that confessions to a priest are unlike all others since they are made not so much to a priest as to the Deity Whom he represents. Therefore a priest, appearing as a witness in his private character, may deny that he knows anything about the matter.

The Denning Report recognizes that cases of marital disharmony cannot be dealt with successfully unless a party can tell his complete story and be assured "that what he says will not be used to his prejudice thereafter". At present it is in the discretion of the judge whether a person who refuses to give evidence shall be committed for contempt. It is no reflection on the judges to say that this is not satisfactory. Nothing can meet the case except legislation, but adequate laws would be difficult to frame. We are confronted with the old question of where the line is to be drawn. It seems to us that what is said in the confessional or in a minister's study, when it becomes in effect a confessional, should never be disclosed. But even the lawyer—the one person who, at present, enjoys "privilege" —is only protected when he is acting in his legal capacity. When we hear things which might as well have been heard by anybody else, we cannot claim an immunity which could not be granted to all our fellow citizens. And are there circumstances in which even the seal of the "confessional" ought to be broken? Suppose, for example, an innocent man is about to be condemned for a murder which somebody else has confessed to a minister. What then?

[2] *English and Empire Digest*, Vol. 22, p. 420.
[3] *Taylor on Evidence*, p. 578.

Yes, a Solomon will be needed to draft this legislation. Until it is effective we hope that marriage guidance consultants and others will refuse to give evidence and risk the consequences. If they are sent to prison there will soon be an outcry and something will be done. There must often be a martyr or two before things are put right!

* * *

THE programme for the May Assembly of the Union is a full and interesting one. It will certainly take its place among the historic Assemblies in the annals of Congregationalism, for Dr. Berry will lay down the office he has held for so long and with such distinction, and his successor will be elected and inducted. The two major subjects for discussion will be Presbyterian-Congregational union and the Home Churches Fund. We will not attempt to forecast any decision which may be made concerning the former, but we believe there will be general agreement that there should be no attempt by anybody to force union unless there is something approaching unanimity. Even if union be rejected there still remains the possibility of closer co-operation and we hope that this will be secured in no small measure. The members of the Commission, who undertook a long and arduous task with no certainty as to its outcome, should not then feel that their time has been wasted even though their highest hopes have been disappointed.

The presentation of reports cannot find a place in the agenda until Thursday morning. We would enter a plea that delegates should do their utmost to remain throughout the meetings. There has been a marked tendency in recent years, at any rate, for the Assembly to evaporate into thin air after Wednesday. There was an occasion last year when it seemed impossible that a decision could be reached on an important question before a session was obliged to adjourn. The Chairman was faced with the dilemma of having to try to secure a decision in a most difficult situation and at the risk of being accused of "rushing the meeting", or of leaving the decision to be taken at a subsequent session by a mere remnant of the delegates—a course which would have been resented by many who had gone home without voting. It is often difficult enough for delegates to leave their Churches or businesses for three days, but one more day's neglect would not in most cases cause total collapse, and it would have some justification if it helped to ensure the proper consideration of the important concerns of the Union.

* * *

MR. CLAUD MULLINS once referred to that "somewhat minor question of capital punishment, which occupies so much attention that would be far better directed to more important penological problems". The Government's Criminal Justice Bill does not refer to the matter

but, as was to be expected, discussion in the Press and elsewhere has concentrated chiefly on the death penalty and flogging, and these are likely to be the chief points at issue in the House of Commons. It is to be hoped, however, that these questions will not be allowed to absorb a disproportionate amount of time and attention. They are important, but it is even more important that we should be sound in our treatment of the criminals who do not stand in peril of either capital or corporal punishment—and they are, after all, the vast majority.

There are, of course, two extreme views of punishment. Mr. Bernard Shaw may be taken as representative of one:

> We should diligently read Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* and accustom ourselves to regard crime as pathological and the criminal as an invalid, curable or incurable. . . . If crime were not punished at all, the world would not come to an end any more than it does now that disease is not punished at all. . . . Punishment is a mistake and a sin.

The other was put forcibly by Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, who was appointed a judge of the High Court in 1879:

> I think it highly desirable that criminals should be hated, that the punishments inflicted upon them should be so contrived as to give expression to that hatred. . . . I think that the proper attitude towards criminals is not long-suffering charity, but open enmity; for the object of the criminal law is to overcome evil with evil.

What is, or should be, the purpose of punishment?

The view that punishment is essentially retributive has been held by many thinkers. Kant, for example, says:

> Juridical punishment can never be administered merely as a means for promoting another good, either with regard to the criminal himself or to civil society, but must in all cases be imposed only because the individual on whom it is inflicted *has committed a crime.*

Sidgwick is of much the same opinion. Common sense, he says, seems to hold that a man, who has done wrong, ought to suffer pain in return *even if no benefit result either to him or to others from the pain.*

The retributive view of punishment looks wholly to the past. A crime has been committed; therefore society must express its horror and it must be wiped out by an appropriate amount of suffering. It is right, of course, that society should show its disapproval of wrong-doing, though it does not necessarily follow that this can best be done by punishment.

In the past penal codes were based almost entirely on the retributive theory. Most people now would agree that it stands for an

important truth, but would recoil from the notion that punishment should be inflicted if neither the criminal himself nor anybody else is to be the better for it. Much more stress is laid on the deterrent function of punishment. Advocates of the retention of the death penalty (and of flogging) generally base their argument on the prophesied increase of crime which would result from leniency. It has yet to be proved, however, that harshness of punishment acts as a deterrent. A former Lord Chief Justice, Lord Hewart, said in his Clarke Hall lecture:

> It is notorious—is it not?—that in the last century harshness of punishment excited the further crime which it sought to prevent. Pickpockets were never so busy or so prosperous as when they plied their craft among the spectators of a public execution. In the very presence of the gallows, those criminals of an earlier day, seeing an opportunity, were blind to the threat.

It does not appear that in countries where capital punishment has been abolished there has been any increase in murder. A famous Scotland Yard man, who certainly knew something about the mentality of criminals, gave it as his considered judgment that the deterrent efficacy of punishment lay less in its severity than in its *certainty*. If he was right we shall do more to stamp out crime by improving methods of detection than by trying to terrify the potential criminal with threats of what he will suffer *if* he is caught.

There are, of course, two aspects of deterrent punishment. It may be used as a warning to the wrong-doer not to repeat his offence, or it may be employed in the hope of preventing others from ever committing the crime. In the second case it may be argued from the Christian point of view that the punishment is wrong because it involves treating a person as a means to an end. But it would be difficult to sustain the argument since in society, as it exists at present, it is inevitable that persons will sometimes be used as a means to the good of others. The argument carries much more weight in those cases when a judge or magistrate inflicts a more severe sentence than the offence in itself would warrant, with the avowed intention of deterring others by "making an example" of the unfortunate prisoner. This, we believe, cannot be defended from the point of view of Christian ethics.

A third view, which holds that punishment is only properly used when its aim is reformation, is more obviously Christian. Some would say that it cannot achieve that end since reformation can only be effected by an appeal to love and not to fear, and they would abolish all punishment. Mr. Claud Mullins points out that many unruly boys at school have been cured by being made prefects by understanding teachers, but it would not do if delinquents appeared

to be better off because of their crimes. (Magistrates, he says, do take that line more often than is known, but they take care to hide their light under a bushel!) "Anarchy would be the result of dealing with all delinquents in accordance with what is best for them". Those who are responsible for administering the law cannot always do in the courts what they would like to do as private individuals.

The practical conclusion would seem to be this: punishment has the threefold aim of expressing the disapproval of society, of deterrence and of reformation. But no treatment can be called Christian which does not aim primarily at reformation. In the light of this what are we to say about the death penalty? Since we believe that death is not the end we cannot say that to execute a murderer is to deprive him of all opportunity. But by putting him to death society finally renounces its responsibility for assisting in his reformation. Have we ever the right to drop that responsibility from our own shoulders, especially if it is even approximately true that "society gets the criminals it deserves"?

The battle over the death penalty is certain to be a hard one, and there should certainly be a free vote in the House. A likely result would seem to be a compromise in which both sides would agree to its suspension for an experimental term of years.

* * *

We have an impression that few ministers now play the traditional round of golf on Monday mornings, and some are a little perplexed as to how they can obtain even the minimum of exercise necessary for health of mind and body. In a MS. on diaries and diarists, which we were privileged to read recently, we found that this problem presented itself 123 years ago to the Rev. John Skinner of Camerton, Somerset, who left 98 volumes of journals to the British Museum, and in our tender solicitude for the health of the ministry we pass on his solution:

> 1825. Wed. January 19. I have discovered a new means of exercise, that is, by running up and downstairs at a stretch, and then walking along the passage, which measures exactly 30 feet in length; there are 14 stairs, so that pacing backwards and forwards will give 168 stairs in 12 descents and ascents, and walking 24 times along the passage at 10 yards each time will give 240 yards. This, repeated alternately for an hour, will afford as strong an exercise as can be required, indeed much stronger than horse exercise or common walking.

We should, perhaps, add that he committed suicide in 1839.

* * *

DR. P. T. FORSYTH

THE MAN AND HIS WRITINGS

By Sydney Cave, M.A., D.D.

On 12th May, 1848, Peter Taylor Forsyth was born in Aberdeen. I gladly respond to the Editor's request that, in this year of the centenary of his birth, I should say something about the Man he was and about the Books he wrote. In the clarification of my thought I owe much to many theologians, but Dr. Forsyth has been to me much more than a great theologian. In the faith of which theology is the expression I owe to him a debt I owe to none except my parents. They led me in childhood to that knowledge of Christ which is life's best possession, but it was from Dr. Forsyth that I first learnt to realize the holiness of God, the infinite condescension of the divine grace, and the strange and humbling experience of God's forgiveness, so that devotion to Christ as a beloved Master passed into, and remains, an awed and grateful faith in the God whose holiness and love and power are manifest in Christ's Cross and Resurrection. Were I to write on The Theology of Forsyth as I might write on The Theology of Schleiermacher or of Ritschl, I should not be expressing my full indebtedness. I prize much his books, and have read some of them many times, but the man was greater even than his books, and the deepest debt I owe him was incurred before any of his more important books were written. Since I am writing for *The Congregational Quarterly*, I trust I may be forgiven if, writing as a Congregationalist for Congregationalists, I do so with an intimacy which would be inappropriate were I addressing those to whom P. T. Forsyth is merely the name of a distinguished, if unusual, theologian.

My own acquaintance with Dr. Forsyth began in 1902 when, as a lad of eighteen, still at school, I called on him at his request in connexion with my entrance to Hackney College. My uncle, under whose leadership the College had been moved from Hackney to Hampstead, had died in December 1900, and Dr. Forsyth had succeeded him as Principal in the following year at the age of 53, the same age as my uncle was when he died. Usually a writer has written some of his more important books before he reaches that age. But the greater books of Dr. Forsyth were all written after that time.

I wish I knew more of the inner development of his earlier years. The external events are, indeed, well known. He was born in Aberdeen, the son of very poor parents, had a brilliant career in the

University there, and was for a short time an assistant-lecturer in Latin. But the call to the ministry was not to be resisted, and, on Robertson Smith's advice, he spent a semester at Göttingen under the great Ritschl. On his return, he entered New College, London, to train for the Congregational ministry. His two years there were interrupted by ill-health and he obtained permission to withdraw, and until 1893 his name was not included in the list of New College students. In his letter to the Board of New College, to be found in its Minutes of 1st October, 1874, he wrote:

> My health will not permit of the prolonged attendance on classes which would be necessary were I to resume my College work. I expect to do much honest work in the Christian cause but I find it can only be by having in my hands the entire disposal of my daily time to that end.

That ill-health was to harass him all his days. He did his work to the accompaniment of pain.

His first two pastorates were in a suburb of Bradford and in Hackney. Neither the Yorkshire nor the London Union recognized him. I should much like to know why. Was it because his views were regarded as so heretical that neither County Union would accept him? Many years later, in his Yale lectures on *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* (pp. 281-9), Dr. Forsyth broke through his reserve and spoke of the change in his interests and thought.

> Might I venture to speak of myself, and of more than thirty years given to progressive thought in connexion, for the most part, with a pulpit and the care of souls? . . . There was a time when I was interested in the first degree with purely scientific criticism. . . . But, fortunately for me, I was not condemned to the mere scholar's cloistered life. I could not treat the matter as an academic quest. I was kept close to practical conditions. I was in a relation of life, duty and responsibility for others. I could not contemplate conclusions without asking how they would affect these people, and my word to them, in doubt, death, grief or repentance. I could not call on them to accept my verdict on points that came near their souls. . . . And I became convinced that they were in no spiritual condition to have forced on them those questions on which scholars so delighted and differed. They were not entrenched in that reality of experience and that certainty of salvation which is the position of safety and command in all critical matters. It also pleased God by the revelation of His holiness and grace, which the great theologians taught me to find in the Bible, to bring home to me my sin in a way that submerged all the school questions in weight, urgency and poignancy. I was turned from a Christian to a believer, from a lover of love, to an object of grace. And so, whereas I first thought that what the Churches

> needed was enlightened instruction and liberal theology, I came to be sure that what they needed was evangelization, in something more than the conventional sense of that word. . . . There was something to be done, I felt, before they could freely handle the work of the scholars on the central positions. And that something was to revive the faith of the Churches in what made them Churches; to turn them from the ill-found sentiment which had sapped faith; to reopen their eyes to the meaning of their own salvation; to rectify their Christian charity by more concern for Christian truth; to banish the amiable religiosity which had taken possession of them in the name of Christian love; and to restore some sense not only of love's severity, but of the unsparing moral mordancy in the Cross and its judgement, which means salvation to the uttermost; to recreate an experience of redemption, both profound and poignant, which should enable them to deal reasonably, without extravagance and without panic, with the scholars' results as these came in.

In deeply moving words Dr. Forsyth proceeds to tell how he prepared himself to take his part in deepening Christian faith and in meeting the need of his time—the need not for "a new comprehensiveness, but a new concentration, a new evangelization". No teacher I have met was less given to speaking of himself than Dr. Forsyth, and I do not remember ever hearing him speak, in lecture or in conversation, of the experiences to which he here refers.

Apart from his book of Children's addresses, written in conjunction with J. A. Hamilton, his first book, dedicated as such to his mother, was on *Religion in Recent Art*. It was published in 1889, soon after he had gone to Leicester, and was an amplification of lectures given in his pastorate at Manchester. It is a very interesting study of Rossetti, Burne-Jones, Watts, Holman-Hunt and Wagner, and won him the friendship and admiration of G. F. Watts, who appreciated gratefully Forsyth's interpretation of his purpose. And Art remained one of the interests of Dr. Forsyth's life. Even as late as 1911, when he was in the full stream of his theological activity, he broke off to discuss the relation of Art to Religion in the book entitled *Christ on Parnassus*.

The first expression of Forsyth's deeper apprehension of the Gospel is to be found in his pregnant essay on *Revelation and the Person of Christ* contributed to the volume entitled *Faith and Criticism* published in 1893. Here we have the characteristic notes of his later teaching. Revelation is Redemption; the Gospel is "the historical actuality of Christ's person and its practical effect upon sinful men"; "the revelation of Christ, being a revelation of holy love, must be condemnation as earnestly as mercy"; "the extinction of our guilt is a pure, unbought, inexplicable act of miraculous grace"; the work of Christ "was not to give an equivalent for sin,

but to effect in man God's own sense of what sin meant for His holiness". For some of us the two greatest names in Congregationalism are those of Dr. Dale and Dr. Forsyth. It is interesting to read in Sir A. W. W. Dale's life of his father that the essay was written when Forsyth was staying with Dale, during a time when Dale was on a holiday in Wales, necessitated by his ill-health. When the book was published, Dale wrote to a friend, "Forsyth's (paper) which I have not quite finished and do not yet wholly understand, is, out of sight, the most brilliant and vigorous[1]". Forsyth prized much Dale's appreciation and friendship, but I notice that, in the reviews appended to the third edition of *Faith and Criticism,* Forsyth's essay is not mentioned. It was other, and much less significant, essays which were praised.

In 1894, Forsyth accepted a call to Emmanuel Church, Cambridge. He was by then a tired, sick man and, a week after he arrived in Cambridge, his wife died. The following year Aberdeen University honoured itself and him by giving him the D.D. degree. In the next year he preached before the Congregational Union one of the greatest sermons I have read, on *The Holy Father,* a glorious exposition of God's grace. In those years the relations between the Church of England and the Free Churches were far less friendly than they are now, and during his time in Cambridge he wrote two books in defence of the Free Church principle, *The Charter of the Church* and *Rome, Reform and Reaction.* It was easy in those days for Free Church speakers to win loud applause by mere denunciation. Forsyth eschewed all such modes of controversy, and the books are models of courteous polemic, dealing not with abuses and injustices but with principles—the relation of the conception of the Church to the New Testament and Reformation doctrine of God's free grace. The International Congregational Council at Boston in 1899 immensely extended the range of Dr. Forsyth's influence. I have heard from some who were there of the extraordinary impression made by his address on *The Evangelical Conception of Authority,* an address which opened with the characteristic words, "The Cross is the final seat of authority, not only for the Church but for all human society." And in that same year was published his suggestive little book on *Christian Perfection.* Dr. Forsyth's years at Cambridge were handicapped by ill-health, and he might not have been able to continue his work had it not been for the gracious lady who became his second wife. Bernard Manning remarks of these years, this "Prince of the Holy Catholic Church" this "vigorous defender of evangelical truth" "made dogmatic theology attractive even to undergraduates, and revived the truest Puritan tradition of the incomparable dignity of the

1 *Life of R. W. Dale,* pp. 636 and 659.

preached Word"[2]. When I went to Cambridge in 1920, the influence of his ministry there was still perceptible. But famous as he had become, he had little recognition from the theological faculty of the University. Its interests at that time were chiefly in historical criticism and scholarship, and there was a failure to realize how great a theologian lived in Cambridge.

In 1901 Dr. Forsyth succeeded Dr. Alfred Cave as Principal of Hackney College, and in his twenty years of service there his great powers reached their full fruition. Under the leadership of Dr. Alfred Cave, the London Theological Colleges had received recognition as Schools of the University, and become part of the new Theological Faculty of the University of which Dr. Alfred Cave, had he lived, would have been the first Dean. Hackney College was very poorly endowed and suffered by comparison in this respect with New College in whose lectures its students shared. Time after time in his College reports, Dr. Forsyth deplored the unwillingness of the Churches to ease the financial burden. He himself had entered the ministry after a prolonged and brilliant University career, and he regretted that so many of those he taught had had only an elementary schooling. Long after he wrote:

> My complaint as to the education of our ministry is that most of the students who come to us have to take up academic subjects after a quadrennium of routine business, following straight on a defective elementary education; so that they are mostly devoid of knowledge of men, habits of study, taste for accuracy or power of concentration. Their most plastic years have been wasted. They have been in quite subordinate positions, and have not had the real education that responsible business can give. They are without what a universal religion requires—a historical background, a cosmopolitan horizon, the atmosphere of serious culture for conscience or imagination, which lifts piety to faith. It is pitiably hard for them to buckle down to accurate subjects[3].

How he would have rejoiced at the higher standards of admission we are now able to demand, and at the type of man who comes to us at New College, in which Hackney and New College are at last united. This brilliant man was very patient with his less gifted students. One thing alone he scorned—not ignorance but ignorant pretentiousness. Those better equipped might take an Arts degree first, but none was allowed to abbreviate his theological course, and the B.D., instituted shortly before he came, became the normal standard for College work.

In spite of the many books he wrote in this period, and his

[2] *The Latter House*, p. 28.
[3] *Reconstruction and Religion Problems of Tomorrow*, 1918, p. 19.

concern for the general welfare of the Churches, Dr. Forsyth made his College his prime interest, and his was, indeed, a cure of souls. As I look back over the years, I realize how immense is the debt I owe him. I came to Hackney College from the City of London School whose genial Headmaster treated those of us who were in the Classical Sixth as if we were almost his contemporaries. It took me a little while to discover that Dr. Forsyth's reserve was due not to austerity but to shyness, and that he was our truest friend. I always regret that he left no record of the prayers in which he led our worship on one morning each week and at the Wednesday evening service. At these services he spoke to us usually from few notes and with entire directness. I still have jottings of some of his sayings. How well he knew the needs of our immaturity.

> Trying to be good is a subtle temptation to many of us. Christ's teaching is, Seek first the Kingdom of God, and all else shall be added to you, including faith.
>
> Above all avoid constant introspection. Don't sail by the soundings. Sail by the stars; look away from self to Christ.
>
> Our faith should not be a faith in faith, but a faith in Christ and therefore should be unconscious of itself. The height of faith is to lose sight of itself in Christ.
>
> Sermons should not demand faith but kindle it. Offer a Christ who compels faith.

We knew that this naturally proud man had been humbled by the grace of God; we felt his awe of God's holiness, and, although there might be much that we could not as yet understand, this, at least, we knew—the greatness of the Gospel, the awful majesty of God and the surprising wonder of His love. By deepening our religion, Dr. Forsyth helped to prepare us for a more adequate theology.

When, after two years in Arts Classes, I began to attend Dr. Forsyth's lectures, I felt at once their fascination. By the London regulations, the teaching had to be historical in approach, but all was lit up by the interest of his comments. And how stimulating was his confidence in those he trusted. I have heard him described as if he were a harsh dogmatist. That was not what I found him. He did not seek to make us echo his words or adopt his idiom. How many of the Principals of that time would have done as he did; when a student who, he knew, took theology seriously, had ventured in his examination paper to criticize some statements made in lectures, Dr Forsyth awarded him nearly full marks, and told his class that he had been glad to incorporate in his lecture notes some of this student's comments.

These years became overshadowed by the "New Theology"

controversy, which raged with a fury which it is hard for this generation to realize, oppressed as it is by war and war's effects. That "New Theology" had for its leader the Rev. R. J. Campbell, and its defeat in Congregationalism was chiefly due to Dr. Forsyth. Dr. Forsyth had no love of controversy, and the conflict was made more painful for him in that R. J. Campbell had been his friend. Dr. Campbell tells us, in the book he wrote after he had joined the Church of England, *A Spiritual Pilgrimage* (p. 83), that, when Dr. Forsyth came to London in 1901, "he wished me to succeed him at Cambridge, putting the suggestion on the modest ground that he had never been able to get inside the University life there, and that he thought I was specially qualified to do so, and had a gift for getting hold of young men of the undergraduate type." Mr. Campbell refused this invitation, and soon after succeeded Dr. Parker as minister of the City Temple. He was a welcome visitor at Hackney College and, indeed, invited us, whenever we went to hear him preach, to sit in the pulpit with him. No preacher had a more romantic charm than he had then—young, frail and enhaloed with white hair—and he had a marvellous gift of addressing a vast congregation as if he were talking to each member of it alone. He was not one of ourselves, and, in spite of his great popularity, was ill at ease in English Nonconformity. At Christ Church he had felt the fascination of Anglo-Catholic piety, and been much influenced by the Neo-Hegelianism which lingered on at Oxford long after. Hegelianism had succumbed in Germany to Ritschl's vigorous attacks. As he has told us, his tendency to monism was increased by his study of the mystics. His was a mind more receptive than critical, and, like many others at that time, he was unduly impressed by those brilliant, little books of radical German scholars, which Williams and Norgate obligingly published in English. The writings of the great constructive theologians which Forsyth knew so well, of men like Kähler, who in recent years in Germany has come again to his own, were not translated, and of them Dr. Campbell seems to have known nothing. His defection, not only from evangelical theology but from evangelical religion, caused great concern, and it was to Dr. Forsyth that men turned more and more for the antidote. In 1905 Dr. Forsyth became Chairman of the Congregational Union. His year of office was handicapped by painful illness, and he had to restrict his work as Chairman to his two addresses to the Assembly. His May address on *The Church as the Moral Authority of Society* was a supremely great address—the greatest I have heard. Some of us who held him dear, and knew how ill he was, listened to it with as much anxiety as appreciation, but, as usual on such occasions, he spoke with a vigour which concealed his bodily weakness. At the

Autumnal Meeting at Leeds, Dr. Forsyth spoke on *The Grace of the Gospel as the Moral Authority in the Church,* and, as Dr. Campbell had preached the Assembly Sermon the night before, his references to "seraphic smatterers in the Gospel," to "pink pieties" and "the wan sanctity of the coterie," were given a personal application he did not intend. At that time of peace and prosperity, Forsyth's exposition of men's grim need seemed to many too gloomy and extreme. We who have lived through two world-wars know that the critics were wrong and Forsyth was right.

Dr. Campbell tells us that "the commencement of the New Theology controversy" dates from the second of two meetings of the London Board of Congregational Ministers which he addressed in the autumn of 1906, and that "at the beginning of January 1907 it suddenly blazed in the daily Press". He does not say that it was he who lit the fire. With strange indiscretion, he gave an interview to a journalist of the *Daily Mail* which saw in the controversy good copy and gave it great prominence, and the interview was reproduced in many other papers.

It is not easy for those too young to remember the controversy to realize how great was the excitement. I hope that some of those now writing Ph.D. theses in "The Theology of P. T. Forsyth" will explore the columns of the religious weeklies of that time. If they do, they will discover an extraordinary confusion. Some of us, as we look back on the Churches of our upbringing, remember gratefully the splendid devotion of many of the older folk, the large congregations, the great Sunday-schools, the immense interest in social amelioration. But there was one thing lacking—competent instruction in Christian truth. When we were perplexed by the impact of modern knowledge, we did not speak of our difficulties to our parents, for to them such difficulties were "doubt" and doubt was sin, nor did we go to our ministers for they, we knew, had no theology and were strangely proud of the fact. When the New Theology controversy emerged, such could give no guidance. Because there was fear, there was bitterness, and some of the attacks on R. J. Campbell had the malice which comes not from faith but from repressed incredulity.

There lies before me as I write an issue of the *British Congregationalist* published a fortnight after the *Daily Mail* interview. In it are short, and often muddled, comments of representative Church leaders of the time. But it contains also an article by Dr. Forsyth on *Immanence and Incarnation,* the first of a series of articles by responsible theologians for which the Editor had quickly and wisely arranged. (That is why I have this copy, for Dr. Forsyth, with characteristic trustfulness, finding his MS. was twice the required length, gave it to me to abbreviate, and told me

to send my abbreviation direct to the Editor). Dr. Forsyth, in this article, made no reference to Dr. Campbell. He argued against views; he did not attack persons. But the issue raised he described as graver than any since the Gnostic controversy of the second century. In this "theosophy of immanence"

> the eternal ideal Christ is a divine principle quite separable from its classic instance, the personality of the historic Jesus. . . . This is no case of selecting certain views from among many which may be held without affecting the prospects of the human soul. It is a case of choosing life or death. I do not say for the choosing individual but for the Church, for its Gospel and for Society. . . . There are modifications of the Old Theology which are demanded by the nature of Evangelical faith itself . . . but this is . . . a new religion with which, when it comes to the last pinch, there can be no terms made by the Church.

It was with this conviction that he fought what seemed to him a deadly menace to the Church's witness. He fought hard, but he fought without malice, and on the high level of Christian truth. I remember how much he deplored to me an article in the *British Weekly* by its Editor which made the kind of attack on Campbell which only one who had been his friend could have made; when, from the other side, the *Christian Commonwealth* published an attack on Dr. Forsyth accusing him of unworthy motives, he told me he had not read the article, and would not do so. Mr. Campbell, as he later regretted, rushed into print a book called *The New Theology*. It is not surprising that Dr. Forsyth remarked of the New Theology that it was "like a bad photograph, under-developed and over-exposed". The words stung because of their truth, and the retort, made by a popular young preacher of that time, that Dr. Forsyth's theology was 'fireworks in a fog" fell rather flat. (In the interests of future historians may I add that this retort was not Silvester Horne's, as a writer in the *Congregational Quarterly* wrote last year? Horne not only did not, but could not, so have spoken for he was one of Forsyth's staunchest friends and shared his concern for the preservation of the Gospel). Some complained of the harshness of Dr. Forsyth's epigram, but, except for its brevity and wit, it was no more severe than Dr. Campbell's own description later of his book:

> It was much too hastily written, was crude and uncompromising in statement, polemical in spirit and gave a totally wrong impression of the quality of the sermons delivered week by week from the City Temple pulpit.

And what could be more ill-judged than to broadcast his conclusions through the medium of the *Daily Mail* as it then was?

It was in this year of acute controversy that Dr. Forsyth gave his Yale lectures on *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* the first of his three greatest books. The book deals not with the manner of preaching but with its content and authority. "The first requirement of the preacher" is not "an orthodox theology which is canned theology gone stale", "but a positive theology which is theology alive, alert and in power". No book so well reveals the distinctive message of Forsyth. The book had a personal interest to me as it nearly got me into a German gaol. Dr. Forsyth asked me to write its detailed Table of Contents, and gave me the book in galley-proofs when I was leaving for Berlin to learn German. That was a time when anarchism was rife in Russia, and the German Government was apprehensive of anarchists entering Germany. At the Frontier, the Customs House Officer drew out the galley-proofs from my kit-bag and got very excited. The pastor of a German Church in England, whom I had talked to on the train, came to my help. The official told him he thought I was bringing into Germany anarchist manifestoes and that I would be arrested until they had been translated. The pastor explained that they were not anarchist manifestoes but galley-proofs, and that they were *Nur Theologie und nicht gefährlich.* They were "only theology", but had their stern and powerful message of God's holiness and judgment been the message of all the Churches—German as well as British—they might have been very "dangerous" to the amoralism which led to the two German wars.

Those who think of Forsyth as a "mere theologian" should read his two books published in 1908: *Missions in Church and State* and *Socialism, the Church and the Poor.* The first contains sermons given on great occasions over a series of years—sermons which seem to me most moving and memorable and which come to me as true words of God whenever I reread them. The second, a little book, reveals Forsyth's deep interest in the condition of the poor, and deals with the Church's relation to social problems.

In 1909 appeared what seems to me the greatest, as it was the most carefully written, of all Forsyth's works, his Congregational Union lectures on *The Person and Place of Christ.* Its form, with its *Reveille and Password, Reconnaissance, The Advance, The Advance in Force,* is not that of academic theology, and in his preface Forsyth wrote, "It is not meant for scholars but largely for ministers of the Word which it seeks in its own way to serve". Actually it is one of the very few significant books on Christology we have in English. It has its place in the history of doctrine for the skill, and indeed, success with which it combines the two traditions in Christology the Alexandrian and the Antiochene—in modern times represented by men like Thomasius and Gore on

the one hand, and by Dorner and Kähler on the other. But its interest is not merely, or chiefly, academic. It is the kind of theology which gives breadth and depth to faith.

Dr. Forsyth is rightly regarded as the great preacher of the Cross, but his two books, *The Cruciality of the Cross* (1909) and *The Work of Christ* (1910), valuable and illuminating as they are, are occasional writings, and do not do for the doctrine of Christ's Work what his Congregational lectures did for the doctrine of Christ's Person. The earlier book gives in expanded form the address he gave at the International Congregational Council at Edinburgh together with an article on *The Moral Meaning of the Blood of Christ.* The latter book is a revision of lectures to ministers at one of Dr. Campbell Morgan's Conferences. From each book very much may be learnt, but each is incomplete. I have long felt that one of the greatest books on the Atonement would have been the book Forsyth might have written but did not write.

In 1911, as we have already seen, appeared Dr. Forsyth's second book on Art, *Christ on Parnassus.* In the following year appeared his short, suggestive book, *Marriage, its Ethic and Religion,* an expansion of a Lecture delivered in connection with the National Council of Public Morals, and his *Faith, Freedom and the Future* in which, in an illuminating way, he illustrated the problem of Authority in Religion by a consideration of the two strands of Independency—Anabaptism and Calvinism.

It was to the problem of Authority that he returned in the longest and most elaborate of his books, *The Principle of Authority in Relation to Certainty, Sanctity and Society,* published in 1913. It owed much to Schaeder's *Theozentrische Theologie* but has a range and glow which that book lacks.

Dr. Forsyth expressed, time after time, his indebtedness to German theology, and the outbreak of war in 1914 was for him all the greater shock and sorrow. Six more books, the last he was to write, appeared during the war-period. The first, *Theology in Church and State,* was written before the outbreak of War, apart from an Appendix, written in September 1914, which pointed out the appalling consequences in Germany of the subservience of religion and morality to State absolutism. Dr. Forsyth's passion for righteousness was outraged by the German invasion of Belgium, and he gave the war his strong support. After a while, the College was closed, and Dr. Forsyth devoted himself to meet the issues which the war had raised. In the *Christian Ethic of War,* he attacked vigorously the "pacifist" position, and in *The Justification of God* dealt with those problems of a Christian Theodicy which the sufferings of war inevitably make acute. His simply written book, *The Soul of Prayer,* is a book not of controversy but of devotion.

The Church had not only to witness to a warring world. It had to strive to be a true Church, and his *Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments* seeks to restore to the Church that understanding of God's grace which "Catholic" and Protestant have alike obscured. His last work, published in 1918, was a lovely little book on *This Life and the Next, The Effect on this Life of Faith in Another.*

When the war ended, he was seventy. For two years more he kept his wonted mental vigour. Then followed a long, distressing illness, and he passed away on Armistice Day 1921. Significantly his last public act had been to give the address at the unveiling of the tablet commemorating his students who had been killed in the war.

Had space allowed, I should have liked to add something on the significance of Dr. Forsyth's message for our time, but that I must leave to Dr. Lovell Cocks to do. Much has been said about the difficulty of his style. It is chiefly older men who thus speak, and to young men much of this talk of obscurity seems rather silly. A generation which regards T. S. Eliot as its poet, will not complain that Forsyth is hard to understand, nor will those familiar with the technical terms of the New Psychology object to his occasional use of an unfamiliar word. (As Dr. Forsyth used to say about Browning, "If you can't read Browning, there is always Ella Wheeler Wilcox!"). He did not write as do most professional theologians. Until he was 53, he was a pastor not a professor, and his style has the amplitude and prolixity of public speech. It is significant that most of his books are described as Lectures. What some call his rhetoric, was due to his eagerness not merely to inform but to convince and to convert. His theology was the intense expression of his religion, and most of his books were obviously written at white heat. His was not a "mind naturally Christian", and, because full faith had come hard, he was able to help others as those cannot who have known nothing of doubt or dereliction. Completely free from all petty vanity, he had known the pride of intellect which made it hard to suffer fools gladly or, indeed, at all. But that pride had passed into humble adoration. He did not fear men but, more than any I have known, he served God with awe and godly fear, and the love he trusted was the holy love he had seen in all its splendour in the Cross. It is not surprising that many younger men, tired of trivialities and feeling the need of a deeper theology, are turning to Dr. Forsyth, and gaining from him what they feel they most need.

His last book was written before the end of the First World War.

Much that was written before then seems irrelevant to the world in which we live, but not his books. He speaks to our estate. If any asks, Where should I begin? I would say, as I do to our students at New College: Read first his daughter's vivid *Memoir,* prefixed to the recent edition of his *Work of Christ,* and, for a short account of his teaching, turn to Canon Mozley's *The Heart of the Gospel,* pp. 67-109. But no summary of his theology can serve as a substitute for his books. There is no better book to begin with than his *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*[4]. To some, as Dr. Denney said, this book "will give the inward and intense satisfaction which Bunyan found in Luther on Galatians; it would seem to them as though Dr. Forsyth had written it out of their own hearts". Then turn to his *Person and Place of Jesus Christ,* perhaps the greatest of all his books, and, if time permits, to his most massive work, *The Principle of Authority;* nor, for other needs, should his little book *The Soul of Prayer* be missed. And those who have read so far will not be content until they have read all his other books.

[4] Its re-publication is announced for this year.

(*Note.*—The article by Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks to which Dr. Cave refers will appear in our next number—Ed.).

In the Scott Holland Lectures for 1946, *Maurice to Temple* (Faber, 16s.), Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt deals authoritatively with the social movement in the Anglican Church which took its rise from the meeting of F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow in 1846. The book is very readable and will repay study if only that we may remind ourselves how far removed is Christian socialism from the variety which is in danger of gliding by easy stages into bureaucracy and totalitarianism. Maurice and his friends stood for the value of personality and for the "liberal" way of life. This book is a timely reminder of much that is important in Christian social thinking.

Readers who are not well acquainted with the subject would find Dr. Florence Higham's *Frederick Denison Maurice* (S.C.M., 6s.) a useful introduction to Mr. Reckitt's book. Those who know her life of Lord Shaftesbury will expect a good biography and will not be disappointed.

L. J. Tizard.

The Good News, by the Rev. H. F. Wickings (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.), is a selective harmony of the Gospels in a modern rendering and with excellent brief notes, by a missionary practised in commending this Good News in Central China.

Professor E. L. Woodward's *History of England* (Methuen, 4s. 6d.) is a masterly and readable survey to 1918, with a penchant for gentle "debunking", but neither spoilt nor enlivened by the author's enthusiasms.

E. C. Blackman.

BIBLICAL AND SECULAR HISTORY

By E. L. Allen, Ph.D., D.D.

If we analyse the procedure of the conscientious historian today, we shall find that it is governed by two principles. These we may describe as the principle of discontinuity and the principle of continuity.

The first requires of him that he should never lose sight of the distance which separates him from the past. Whatever else may or may not be true of that past, one thing is certain: it is other than the present. Previous ages had their own standards, which are not ours. Hence we must be all the while on our guard against the distortion which results once we read back our own ideas into them.

On the other hand, the present is not self-created. It is the child of the past and carries with it marks of its origin. Men were men in the ancient world as they are in the modern; their personal jealousies and their party struggles are strangely like ours. It seems at times as though mankind has at its disposal only a strictly limited number of patterns of thought or action, so that it does but reproduce these from period to period in widely different settings.

We may say, perhaps, that the principle of discontinuity guarantees the objectivity of historical research; it ensures that one does not impose oneself on the period one is studying, but allows it to tell its own tale. On the other hand, the principle of continuity enjoins upon one sympathy. However strange a period may seem, one must search one's own experience till one finds something in it which will facilitate understanding. There is thus a delicate balance to be preserved. The historian must both allow the past its full rights and use whatever available means of insight the present puts at his disposal. It is this blending of similarity and difference which gives to history at once its utility and its spice. The past is near enough to be our guide and yet challenging enough to enlarge our personalities by close acquaintance with it. The great historian is the man who has the gift of using his experience to interpret the past without imposing his preconceptions upon it.

History, of course, is the work of historians, and the historian is himself always a man of a particular age and its social types. It follows that there is no final version of the past, but only one which changes with cultural development. For each phase in this development brings with it its own judgment on what is important, and this in turn decides what is to be selected from, and emphasized

in, the past. One reads Grote and Mommsen with all the more benefit when one has some knowledge of nineteenth century political ideals. Trevelyan's *English Social History* could not have been written in a generation dominated by the aristocracy and insensitive to the lot of the common people. We did not really become alive to the influence of economic factors in ancient Greece till we arrived at a stage in our own history at which precisely those factors were dominant. That is not to say, of course, that the historian is a mere social product. He is by temperament and training an intellectual. As such, while he belongs to his environment, he is freer from it than other men. In a complex society like our own he is able to identify himself in imagination and sympathy, first with one standpoint and then with another, and so to extend his own experience that he can do justice to what is strange in the past.

We have spoken of the objectivity of the historian. How far does this extend? Is he impartial? That, of course, raises the question whether impartiality is even a desirable quality in one concerned often with great moral issues. Historians today are less disposed to claim for their discipline the rank of a science than they once were; they realize how limited is their knowledge and how hedged about by relativity their results. Impartiality consists, we may say, not in approaching one's materials without presuppositions (that is frankly impossible), but in knowing what those presuppositions are and in being open to receive any criticism of them which one's study of the materials may suggest. It is worth noting that there are even instances in which a bias may be useful in a historian. Especially is that the case where the bias is in favour of some minority which has had little publicity, so that he is able to redress the balance. The danger to be guarded against is that of mere propaganda, when facts are deliberately distorted in the interests of a party thesis, as has happened in Russia.

One important point remains to be noted. It is that history as we are familiar with it is a purely human narrative. The factors it recognizes are individual and social, in addition, of course, to those of a natural order. By common consent, the supernatural is ruled out. God does not enter history, but only the idea of God as something which influences men's actions. The historian may raise some questions, probably of a political or less often of an ethical character. Ultimate questions he does not touch, since he does not concern himself with the total process of history but only with some parts of it. Even should he write the history of the race, he leaves out the beginning and the end. Such matters are for the philosopher and the theologian, for Hegel and Augustine.

True, one man may play both parts, as Arnold Toynbee does today. But the methods adopted for *A Study of History* would be unacceptable if applied to the annual *Survey of International Affairs* from Chatham House.

II

It is precisely here that history as we meet it in the Bible is differentiated from the history we learned in our school or college days. Biblical history is the work of men who set out from an assurance of the beginning and the end of things, who see what happens in time against the background of creation and eschatology. History in the old Testament is a work of faith, a witness to the living God and His purpose with the world and the race of men. As such, it is concerned primarily with those ultimate questions our historians do not raise and only secondarily with those to the answering of which they devote their labours. But the faith in which this type of history is written is, be it noted, not really a first-hand faith. The historians of the Old Testament are disciples of the prophets, and the faith of which we have just spoken was one thing in the prophet and another in the disciple. Whereas the former saw the hand of God in the present, the latter set out to describe how He must have worked in the past.

Such men give us, that is to say, a religious interpretation of their people's history, and the categories with which they operate are prophetic in origin. It follows from this that there is no one type of history in the Old Testament, but rather several types, each corresponding to some definite phase in development and to the extent to which this had assimilated the prophetic message. We may perhaps place the three great schools of historians in Israel, the Jahwist, the Deuteronomic, and the Priestly in three periods. The first belongs to the time of national unity and fulfilment under David, the second to the closing years of Judah's independence, and the third to the community gathered round the Second Temple. Each inevitably reads the past in the light of his own day.

Furthermore, these various renderings of the past are not so many individual achievements; those responsible for them sink their personalities in the community to which they belong. They share its life and are sustained by its faith; history as they conceive it is the record of something which that community carries with it in its present. The Hebrew historian, we may say, was the bearer of a communal memory. This is something poles apart from being the agent of party propaganda; that is artificial and smacks of self-deception, while the other is natural and the honest expression of what men actually felt in the present and saw in the past.

History, then, was didactic for Israel; it taught by examples. Hence the determination with which Jeroboam is pilloried for "the sin wherewith he made Israel to sin," though a modern critic may be disposed to defend that monarch's religious policy as essentially conservative, based as it was on the ancient shrines of Dan and Bethel. History was didactic too in the ancient world and in the Middle Ages: it was necessarily so when it was written for a small public, and that composed largely of persons in responsible positions in the society of their time, whether as religious teachers or as political leaders. We may say that the Old Testament was written before the distinction had been drawn between history and the philosophy of history; better still, before the art of reviving the past in the mind of a community had become detached from that religious setting in which that art arose in the first instance.

We are accustomed to the expression of religious ideas through various art-forms, the drama, music, painting, and so on. What is so difficult for us to understand is that earlier times used history for exactly the same purpose. The message of the prophets—in varying degrees of purity—was expressed by their disciples and conveyed to the multitude through the medium of a narrative of events in the past. Not a few of our natural criticisms of Old Testament history arise from the fact that we do not constantly bear in mind that it is religious symbolism in the first instance, reproduction of the past only in the second place and as a means to this.

It follows from this that the Hebrew writers selected from the past what would serve their purpose, what would enable them to show God at work in the events which went to the making of their people. Hence the striking fact that so redoubtable a ruler as Omri is passed over in a few sentences, while the conflict between Elijah and Jezebel is related in great detail. The one concerned only the political development of the Northern Kingdom, in the other its soul was at stake. We see here the working of that law which governs all symbolism, that the truth which is to be expressed through the symbol can only work by first mastering it and subduing it to its purpose, so that, in the judgment of those who look on at the process with strange eyes, the symbol undergoes distortion. The reflection of the total personality in a portrait is in this sense distorted by comparison with what a photograph would show, though in another sense it is more adequate to it.

How far is this process carried? Does the Biblical historian, seeking to express in a narrative the truth which has claimed his whole being, ever go so far in selecting and emphasizing his material that, perhaps without knowing it, he ends by inventing a narrative to convey that truth? Is there any element of *midrash* in his work, of story, that is, which has no basis in fact but serves to point

a moral? The answer must be that there are narratives in the Old Testament which seem to owe their existence almost, if not indeed altogether, to the creative imagination of the writer as kindled by his faith. It is not merely that he accepts legend when his sources give it to him; he is himself a maker of legend at times. The obvious instance here is the Chronicler. Though recent study of his work makes it necessary to revise some of the sweepingly adverse judgments which have been passed on him, we can scarcely doubt that, for example, the story of Abijah's campaign against Jeroboam in *2 Chron.* 13 is a work of the pious imagination. The same may probably be said of the book of *Jonah* and of *1 Kings* 13, which perhaps owes something to the career of Amos and Josiah's reforms in the North.

III

We can best sum up what has been said so far with the help of an analogy. When I look back upon my past life and those phases in it which have since become strange to me with the growth of my experience, I can speak of it in two ways. I can pass judgment on those phases in the light of my present standards of conduct or can employ for that purpose the standards with which I actually operated at the time. In reconstructing the past of a community, the Old Testament historians adopted the former method; we should prefer—in strict history—the latter. Each, surely, has its own justification.

We go on now to the question how far the distinctions already established apply when we pass from the Old Testament to the New. Much, of course, is very similar. The writers of the *Gospels* and *Acts* are not interested students of a period of religious history; they are ardent disciples of the Master, seeking to win others for faith in Him. The words of the Fourth Evangelist might have been used by the other three equally: "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in His name." Further, the writers give individual form to a common tradition on which they draw and which they hand on to others. As we arrange the *Gospels* in their probable order of composition, we find that they fall into a series comparable with that presented by the various strata of Old Testament history. The portrait of Jesus is redrawn on each occasion in accordance with what the growing faith of the Church has come to see in Him.

Nevertheless, one important point has to be noted in which the Synoptists, at any rate, stand nearer to our own time than the Old Testament writers do. If they work, as above described, with the principle of continuity, they employ also the principle of discontinuity. They are aware, that is, that much which was central

in the Church's life as they know it was not yet to be found in the circle gathered round Jesus. It is amazing, in fact, that the evangelists resisted so well the temptation to read back into the past what they were themselves familiar with. Whatever be the explanation of Mark's theory of the Messianic secret, it shows that he was conscious that the post-resurrection faith could not be imposed upon his sources. The evangelists use the term "Son of man" of Jesus, though it was not current in the Church of their own day; of some fourteen controversies with the Jewish authorities in Mark, not one touches upon circumcision. There is in all this evidence of a genuine concern for what actually happened, a respect for facts.

At the same time, it must be admitted that, as in the Old Testament, the distinction between record of fact and religious symbolism is at times well-nigh obliterated. Each evangelist deals in his own way with the material at his disposal, whether written or oral, emphasizing and retouching so as to bring out what is important for his purpose. Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount so arranged the teaching of Jesus as to demonstrate unmistakably its character as the new Torah. Mark groups controversies so as to leave on our mind the impression that conflict with the synagogue authorities was the main feature, along with exorcisms, of the Galilean ministry. In his account of the Trial, Luke rewrites Mark so as to pass over what is of interest only to Jews and would not appeal to his Gentile readers.

But do any of them go further than this? Is there any element of *midrash* in the Gospels? Are there any instances in which faith has not merely shaped or modified a narrative, but has actually created it? Here again the answer is in the affirmative. It must be insisted, however, that the process is an unconscious one, to be explained after the analogy of artistic creation, and not as mere party-propaganda. One might instance Matthew's stories of the fish taken with a coin in its mouth, as also that of Pilate's wife and her dream. *Mark* $8^{22\text{-}26}$ with its healing in two stages seems designed to introduce the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, with the two questions asked by the Master, though there may well be a historical basis to the narrative. Luke's account of the sermon at Nazareth can scarcely be other than a rewriting of the Marcan story so as to make it a symbol of the fate in store for the Preacher, His rejection by the Jews and His acceptance by the Gentiles.

What of the *Fourth Gospel*? John is not one of those mystics for whom history is in itself valueless and may be discarded once the ideas which it suggests are apprehended. He is convinced that he is offering at once a factual account of the Lord's life which is superior to that of the Synoptists, and an interpretation of it which

is ultimately the work of the Holy Spirit. We, however, must try to get behind this unity of fact and symbol and to ask whether there was not perhaps, either in John himself or in the community on whose tradition he drew, some unconscious creation of facts to symbolise truths. The Cana miracle, for example, may well have been developed gradually out of some sayings of Jesus till it became a picture of how He turned the austerity of the Law into the joy and freedom of the Gospel. Something of the same kind may lie behind the story of Lazarus. The faith of the writer not only illuminates facts, it creates them. But he is not conscious of this, either during the process or when he surveys the finished product.

> It is almost true to say that for the Judaism of the beginning of our era the distinction between history and philosophy is a distinction of degrees, not of kind. All history is a history of God's dealings with men: all true philosophy is an understanding of God in the light of those dealings[1].

Our enquiry has led us to a similar conclusion. For the writers of the Bible, history has not become secularized and restricted to the human as with us; hence it is a vehicle of religious ideas, a form of symbolism. Or, as the Biblical writers themselves would have said, it is a witness to the power and wisdom of the living God.

This raises the all-important question: Can we repeat the Biblical affirmation of "God in history," when we do not understand history as the Bible does? On this three brief observations may be made.

(a) We must distinguish between history as event and history as subsequent record of what once took place. If we mean history in the first sense when we speak of God in history—and that is the only sense which has meaning for us today—then we have here a justification of the labour of historical research. For it brings us nearer to what is of supreme importance, the discovery of what actually happened at those moments in the past which are fraught with God's revelation. It has been argued to weariness, of course, that there is no such thing as bare fact without some modicum of interpretation. That may be conceded, and still we shall hope to get nearer to the event as we force our way through successive interpretations which interpose between us and it. The rediscovery of the historical situation which Hebrew prophecy was called upon to meet has given us an insight into God's ways with men far superior to what we had when we still thought of the prophets as so many exponents of the Mosaic law. The most conservative theologian of today has a more vivid and convincing picture of Jesus Christ because of the work of scholars whose aim was to

1 W. L. Knox in *Judaism and Christianity*, vol. ii, 61.

return as nearly as posible to what He said and did in Galilee. The historical study of the Bible is thus the study of the way in which God has actually worked with and for mankind.

(b) We must distinguish between the principle that God works in history and the particular applications which are made of that principle in the Bible. We may retain the former, while not holding ourselves committed to the latter. Thus we may hesitate to follow the New Testament writers who see in the ruin of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 a judgment of God for the rejection of the Messiah. It may well seem to us that the prayer from the Cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" is more in accordance with the mind of God. We may say with confidence that God led Israel out of Egypt, though we shall find the evidence for that less in the plagues of Egypt and the crossing of the Red Sea than in the spiritual quality of Moses.

(c) We must distinguish, finally, between the faith of the prophet who sees God in the events of his own day and that of the disciple who tries to explain and schematize how God worked in the past of his people. If we are to believe that God works in history, it must be with the first kind of faith. There is a marked contrast between an Isaiah confronting Ahaz with the assurance of God's presence in his danger and a Deuteronomist constructing his framework for the old stories of the Judges. Neither, to be sure, is infallible, but the one does stand ready to venture all here and now on what he believes.

If we are to see God in history, we can do so only as we ourselves enter into history as it is being made around us. We must enter into it as responsible agents whom God has called to know and serve His purpose. As we follow the promptings of conscience, as we commit ourselves to righteousness where it is weak against unrighteousness where it is strong, we shall win the assurance that we are in the conflict as those whom God has sent thither, and whom He does not leave alone. And sometimes, whether in the stress of action or in the quiet of reflection, we shall know that what we do, imperfect though it be, is taken up into His purpose and serves His Kingdom.

To produce an adequate summary of architectural development from the earliest times to the present day, in a little over two hundred small pages, would seem an almost impossible task until one reads Mr. Martin S. Briggs' *Architecture,* in the "Home University Library" (Oxford Press, 5s.). This little book deals with the great theme in a crisp, concise manner which makes good reading. It is much to be regretted that the line drawings are lacking in these same qualities, for they are dull and unimaginative, in many cases being confused with laborious penwork quite unsuited to the reduction required by the small size of the volume. HUGH COLLINSON.

THE CURRENT CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO INDUSTRIAL QUESTIONS

By Malcolm Spencer, M.A.

I hope I am sufficiently well known to readers of *The Congregational Quarterly* to be allowed to write this article somewhat biographically. I have been in or near the centre of most of the concerted attempts to define a specifically Christian attitude to industrial questions since the Copec Conference of 1924, and I think the subject can be most usefully presented in a descriptive rather than in a documentary way. Moreover I am writing in circumstances in which I have no access to records of any kind. My aim therefore will be to set out, in very broad terms, the main trends of Christian thinking as I have known it during the last twenty-five years.

When I speak of 'Christian thinking', 'Christian attitudes', and the like, I mean thinking which is endeavouring to see its subject in the way a Christian should; thinking that is animated by a desire for the impress of Christ upon every sphere of life; thinking that proceeds from Christian convictions about the true ends and standards of human living. This is no attempt to depict a specifically Christian industrial system, over against a specifically secular system: it is, rather, an attempt to find directives which should govern Christian action in the handling of the industrial problems which are presented to us by our present industrial order—an order which has taken shape under all the diverse pressures of human aspiration and human sin and selfishness which make up the variegated pattern of human motive. Professional economists with a Christian valuation of life have been contributing to such Christian thinking in their professional writings, so far as they have allowed themselves to express value judgments: but my article is concerned only with the contributions to Christian thinking made by groups which have been consciously co-operating to express these Christian judgments. The groups I have in mind include especially the Copec Commissions, the business men's research groups of the Christian Social Council, a British Council of Churches Commission, the Economics section of the International Life and Work Conference held at Oxford in 1937, the Industrial Christian Fellowship and Christendom groups of the Church of England, and the corresponding organs of Christian social thinking in the Free Churches.

If the approach is right the article should be of a kind appropriate to Christian preaching and teaching and not of a kind appropriate to a technical journal—though it should, at the same time, be unassailable from technical standpoints. I think it is urgently necessary that the Churches should be staging discussions of the conclusions here set forth and Church members set on the tracks of the business and political action to which they point. Technical questions outside the scope of Church discussion will arise beyond that point; but I hope that, as far as the article goes, it will be matter for positive non-technical Christian conviction and pronouncement.

I—The First Humanitarian Approach

Up to and including the days of Copec, Christian thinking was concerned mainly with a criticism of the outcome of our industrial system: it had not reached the point of constructive suggestion or direction. It was concerned with the iniquity of sweated labour, the need to establish minimum standards of wages and working conditions, the claim for workers' interests to be effectively expressed through the instrumentality of Trade Unions, the dishonourable excesses of profit seeking in monopoly companies, and fraudulent market transactions and the like. These were all matters on which Christian thinking was hardly to be differentiated from the thinking of all men of sensitiveness and goodwill. The strife and suffering to which these conditions gave rise were obviously repugnant to all kindly people. The elimination of these conditions has in fact come now to be recognized as a necessity for any civilized community. If the goals of twenty and thirty years ago have not yet been fully achieved, they have at least been universally recognized as goals for immediate achievement. Perhaps we should take some encouragement from that fact. These aims, however, were mostly concerned with the bad end-products of industrial activity and not with the essential character of the industrial structure itself. There was a certain amount of Christian discussion round the question of private versus public ownership of the means of production, but the different views held on this subject were based rather on different estimates of the relative efficiency of the alternatives than upon any clearly stated Christian principles of recognized validity.

In these last twenty years, however, Christian social thinking has moved on to much more radical questions and links itself more effectively with the basic Christian conceptions of the nature of man and the divine purpose for human society. These more fundamental discussions move round two main points. The first of these is the enslavement of mankind as a whole to the mechanism which man has created for the ampler supply of his material wants. The second, which grows out of the first, is the enslavement of man as an indi-

vidual to forms of work which frustrate the proper expression of his personality. The initial subordination of human activity in general leads on to the subordination of individual personality to processes which are destructive alike of personality and human community. The subjection of industrial and social ends to the demands of an arbitrary financial mechanism leads on to the development of machine processes along lines which make man as much the servant of the machine as the machine is the servant of man. The forms of work which are thus prescribed for the individual are to a large extent such as are incompatible with his regarding his work in life as a worthy offering of his best to the service of God and his fellows.

What is thus involved will become clearer when it is set out below under specific headings; but one illustration of the change of outlook will be useful first. The earlier discussion of justice in the distribution of the profits of industry seems to have brought us to the conclusion that the question who gets possession of wealth that is above the minimum needed for wholesome living is a matter of minor concern to a Christian as such: he is no more called to be a judge and divider in these matters than his Master. He is concerned, however, that the whole structure of industry is designed to secure that the basic physical needs of men are amply supplied for everybody; and he discovers that, in the last analysis, the industrial machine is geared to other ends than this—to maximum financial gains for those who possess financial power—irrespective of the human consequences.

II—The Financial Factor in Industry

This feature of the industrial structure was the first to come under Christian examination in the period of the Christian Social Council (from the winding up of the Copec organization to the launching of the British Council of Churches). Those were the years in which Major Douglas and his followers were urging the fundamental unsoundness of our present financial mechanism and advocating specific reforms under the title of Social Credit. The Christian Social Council groups never identified themselves with these specific proposals; but they did endorse the view that the whole process of production and distribution was crippled by its subordination to a false conception of the part which finance played in industry and by the consequent misdirection of the public credit. Credit power was in the main being added to the power of private wealth to bend the policy of industry to its own advantage instead of being used to correct that tendency in the public interest. A member of the group had resigned his place as one of the directors of the Bank of England, on the score that its policies had inevitably led to the vast increase of unemployment in the late 'twenties and early 'thirties,

confessedly "in the interests of the City of London". The Christian Social Council came in for a good deal of opprobrium on this account; but in the exigencies of war the substantial truth of its contention came to be recognized. Public financial policy was for the first time consciously regulated in the interests of a balanced and adequate supply of what were then judged to be the nation's needs, and that regulation followed the lines which the Christian Social Council group had advocated. It is not sufficiently realized that the same misdirection of financial power which imposed unemployment on this country was at the same time imposing an even greater problem of unemployment on Germany, with consequent impoverishment of the greater part of Europe, and that the social disorder so produced was a main cause of the surrender of Germany to the programme and leadership of Adolf Hitler.

The Christian Social Council's 'Policy for Industry' was published on the eve of war and it consequently received little attention, though it still stands as a manifesto with which the industrial and financial policy of the war years can be compared. Building on the foundation thus laid, the British Council of Churches' Commission on Industry prepared and published the pamphlet, *Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction,* which won considerable commendation both here and abroad. It was remarked by an academic writer that the Charter for Industry promulgated by the International Labour Organization from Philadelphia three years later reproduced almost exactly the lines of the 'Charter for Industry' which formed the core of the Churches' statement. A representative of several continental papers asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to introduce him to the draughtsman, and in the consequent interview he told me that our policy seemed to promise the correction of those features of British Imperial Economy which, in the view of countries like Switzerland and Sweden, had been such a constant threat to the peace and prosperity of the world. This pamphlet circulated widely in America also, and Dr. Van Dusen hailed it as the first ray of light on the problem of the Trade War between Britain and America which, on all the accepted premises of economic life, was the inevitable prospect in the post-war period.

This tendency to present the world with the alternatives of war or unemployment, inherent in an economy which leaves the initiative in industrial development in the hands of large capital interests acting primarily from the motive of maximum financial profit, and almost blindly in regard to the social consequences of their policies, is now partially corrected in this country, but it remains with much smaller checks in America. This means that the Russian fear that the capitalist countries will ultimately find themselves driven to choose war as a necessity for their economic survival

is still well founded. The fact that the steps to this result may be taken quite unconsciously and unwillingly is beside the point. The Life and Work Conference of 1937 laid it down that all human systems (whether political or economic) are essentially power systems, unconsciously subject to the elements of greed and pride and selfishness in the social group which were most influential in framing them. They are in no sense 'natural' systems shaped by the necessities of economic co-operation; still less are they 'righteous' systems shaped for the restoration of human justice, however much they may seem to be, and are a complex of fine bargains regulated by legal restraints. The 'economic man' of the classical economists is thus seen to be not the natural man whose character must be taken as scientifically inevitable, still less the man made in the image of God; but rather the 'man of sin', in Paul's terminology, the fallen man whom it is the business of government to circumvent. It is not surprising, therefore, if the free play of an economic system initially shaped in the interests of wealth and strength should create great aggregates of wealth that are ever more powerful and ever more dangerous, unless effectively countered or controlled. In this country a tolerable balance of power between the interests of the few and the interests of the many is now secured by the joint operation of taxation and the public control of credit power. Heavy taxation is not required only to meet the cost of the national services: it is a lamentable necessity in so far as it reduces the standard of life of would-be spenders, but it is also a necessary device for draining off large aggregates of potential investments which would otherwise be free to flow into channels which might distort the desirable pattern of industrial production.

There can be no harmony in a world in which economic forces have free play unless there are international devices for adjusting the balance of money power. Hence, in a day like ours when the world is becoming economically one, there can be neither peace nor prosperity unless the larger aggregates of wealth are subject to international adjustment, by whatever may prove to be the appropriate equivalents of taxation and credit issue, both administered consciously in the interests of the many. In God's world the strong must be made to serve the weak whether by inward constraints or outward compulsions — the former by preference but the latter if necessary. Otherwise they will exploit the weak and destroy the world and themselves with it. Thus while from the standpoint of current ungodliness, which holds that 'a man has a right to do as he will with his own', the Marshall plan looks like a bit of international generosity, from the standpoint of divine justice and economic realism it is only the first small instalment of the international balance of money power without which the world in general and

America in particular will soon be engulfed in economic depression.

To illustrate the point that production is now geared to other objectives than the maximum service of human need I quote three instances. Some years ago I was sought out by an American millionaire and his wife, who asked for a leisurely interview in my own home, because they wished advice as to how they could best invest their money in the public interest. They could find no advisers on this subject in their own country at that time. Their bankers and brokers said that they were only competent to advise them how to invest from the point of view of the security or improvemnt of their own financial position. I had to tell them that neither I nor anyone else could point them to any competent source of advice on this question because it was nobody's business to assemble the relevant data: I could only give them an amateur personal opinion, for what it was worth.

The second instance is that of an inventor who reported that his twenty years' work had led to the saving of $2\frac{3}{4}$ million pounds per annum in production costs, but that this had not led to any increase in the services rendered by his industries to the public or in the lightening of the burden of labour or improvement of their position for the workers. The two motives of his life work thus remained unsatisfied: indeed the result was worse than that. The saving he had effected on production costs was chiefly offset by an increase in selling cost, nearly equalling the $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions saved; the gap between the two figures represented an increase of profit for ownership and an addition to the number of the unemployed.

The third instance is taken from a recent study of South Wales. Industrial research has brought to light a great variety of processes for utilizing the bye-products of coal: all these processes could be effectively developed in South Wales and, had there been some regional oversight able to sway the decision, a considerable body of light industries of this kind might have been organized in South Wales. This would have greatly eased the employment problem in the great depression which compelled the emigration of half a million young people for work elsewhere. So long, however, as the initiative in the matter rested with cosmopolitan companies with no special concern for a balanced pattern of Welsh industries, the location of these subsidiary industries would be and was determined by considerations of a purely statistical kind which carried them over the border. For small financial gain to large corporations Wales suffered incalculable social loss; and the incidental economic loss must have far exceeded the economic gains which the companies achieved.

The broad result of these lines of Christian thinking is thus to commend a new general attitude for Christian people to adopt

toward industry and a new series of technical problems for Christians to envisage as their primary concerns if they occupy positions of responsibility in the industrial or financial world. The general position is that there is an inherent bias in the economic structure which gives great economic power to financial corporations which they have neither motive, interest nor ability to wield for the common good. The Christian public should therefore be interested in and quickly ready to give favourable consideration to all competent proposals for bringing economic and financial power under the control of commissions competent to judge the balanced interest of the community, or for putting the economic strength of the stronger countries at the service of weaker ones. Proposals for establishing some kind of parliament of industry with power to authorize financial budgets for industry as a whole belong to the first class, and the recent ½ per cent British loan to Russia to the second.

III—Industrial Vocation

I have not left myself much space in which to discuss the second large principle to which Christian thinking is now being directed—the necessity of organizing industry so that those who engage in it are able to regard their working life as a substantial element, perhaps the largest single element, in their self-dedication to God. Brevity is, however, more appropriate on this point, since the study of the matter is still in its early stages.

The high light in my experience in the posing of the problem was at the Ecumenical Oxford Conference of 1937, when Father Bulgakov of the Eastern Orthodox Church opened a week's discussion in the Economic section with the remark, "Of course we must begin by recognizing that our economic science is a heathen science whose conclusions must be received with great reserve because it sets out to answer a question which Christian men ought never to have asked. The fundamental question of economic science is how may goods be produced most cheaply and most plentifully and without regard to the questions how they are produced or how they are to be used. Having once asked the wrong question to start with, the subsidiary questions followed on the same wrong lines and a misleading body of knowledge was thus built up. Had the right original question been asked the resultant body of knowledge would have been entirely different. The question the Christian ought to have asked is 'How can men be employed to the greater glory of God?' ".

"That question must, from now on, be the central industrial question with which Christian people concern themselves. There can be no possibility of religious revival in this country till we can

answer the question, 'How can work be once more made into a religious vocation under the hostile conditions of mass production and the technique of a machine age?' Studies in this subject are beginning to be made, the chief contributors so far being Dorothy Sayers and T. M. Heron, who have been in collaboration on the matter. Dorothy Sayers' brilliant little book, *Why Work?* avers that the Churches' contribution to industrial policy has so far been vitiated by their failure to elaborate a Christian conception of work. T. M. Heron, who is head of a small industry, has made several contributions to the subject, the chief of them being a chapter in the recently published symposium of the Christendom group entitled *Prospect for Christendom*. In this chapter he develops the conception of work as prayer. If we cannot pray about our work and make our work itself a prayer we are on wrong lines. For this starting point he faces all the complications of modern processes. The adverse influence he traces, not chiefly to machinery as such, but to the exploitation of the possibilities of machine production without sufficient regard to the human interests at stake''. These and other contributors are working in touch with one another, and there are at least two large-scale concerted studies of the subject in prospect for the coming year—one a week's crusade in Yorkshire with the Christian doctrine of work as its single theme; the other a study of the subject against the background of the mining industry in Wales. These, and it may be other ventures, will be bound to produce in the near future the written material which will make possible the widespread discussion of the subject in clear, concrete terms. Perhaps I may have opportunity to go into the matter again more fully when that stage is reached.

P.S.—The plea here made for the overall regulation of economic power is not to be taken as an expression of approval for any one method of achieving the desired result: the Churches' commission made no final pronouncement on that matter. It did, however, express a general preference for measures which would secure the maximum of autonomy and freedom compatible with social order, for the varied units comprised in any great industry. These may be local or regional units, or they may be functional units such as the labourers, craftsmen or technicians of a given factory. Congregationalists should share this concern for the maximum of personal and local autonomy.

ARTHUR MACHEN

AN APPRECIATION

By P. A. SPALDING, M.A.

To most people the name of Arthur Machen, who died on 15th December, 1947, at the age of 84, suggests the Angels of Mons, a legend of the first World War, created, or at least anticipated, by his story *The Bowmen*. Among those of an older generation the name will revive memories of fifty years ago, of a decade of literary scandals, the era of the *Yellow Book* and the *Great God Pan*. But to those, young or old, who care intensely for the art of writing, who do not assess the merit of a writer by his ability to sell his books in thousands, the death of Arthur Machen is a not insignificant event in the history of English literature.

Machen himself once said that for 18 books written in 42 years he had received only £635; but, though recognition was tardy and always limited, he became a classic in his lifetime. What his audience lacked in size, it made up for by enthusiasm, and the ardour of the discriminating was reflected (with the usual irony) in the vagaries of the saleroom, where, long before the author's death, first editions of his works were selling for more than he made by writing them.

The reasons why recognition came so slowly are clear enough, and throw some light on Machen's character, as man and writer. For one thing, to write a book that, however unjustly, proves a *succès de scandale*, is to cut oneself off from the attention of serious critics. Give a dog a bad name . . . The proverb applies with special force to books and authors. This was the unfortunate fate of Machen, whose *Great God Pan*, though entirely innocent in intention, was not only misunderstood at the time (it seems harmless enough now), but for long remained, perhaps still remains, his best-known, though it is far from being his best, book. Written avowedly in imitation of Stevenson and in his 'New Arabian' manner, this story and others of the same period, though containing striking epigrams and descriptive passages which suggest the splendours of his later style, are too artificial to convince. Invention was never his strong point, and it is not as a story-teller or novelist that he will be remembered.

But there is another and more significant reason for Machen's failure to reach a wider audience. Though for part of his life a professional journalist, he was always the genuine man of letters who

could write books only when the spirit moved him. He would not accept commissions, though he received many, and this accounts not only for his relatively small output, but also for the fact that he was never at any time, except during the years in Fleet Street, able to earn a living by his pen.

It is unfashionable nowadays to look upon writing as an art, or the writer as subject to the comings and goings of 'inspiration'. We prefer to think of authorship as a trade, to cite the example of Trollope, who, with his eye on the clock, turned out a regulation number of pages day after day till one work was finished, when another could be immediately begun. We agree with Dr. Johnson that "a man may always write when he will set himself *doggedly* to it". But it remains true, and Machen is a case in point, that the really worthwhile books are born more often than not of inner necessity, and written less as a result of deliberate choice than in obedience to incalculable impulse. Machen's style has been called precious, a charge to which every writer of careful and coloured prose lays himself open; and his theory and practice of literature are despised by those who have reacted violently from the doctrine of art for art's sake, which the 'nineties tended perhaps to carry to excess. But in any other sphere we should admire the man who chooses to give nothing if he feels he cannot give his best, who prefers to live relatively poorly or to follow an uncongenial trade, rather than compromise his conscience. And the artistic conscience is as real, and may be as exacting, as any.

* * *

> I shall always esteem it as the greatest piece of fortune that has fallen to me, that I was born in that noble, fallen Caerleon-on-Usk, in the heart of Gwent. My greatest fortune, I mean, from that point of view which I now more especially have in mind, the career of letters. For the older I grow the more firmly am I convinced that anything which I may have accomplished in literature is due to the fact that when my eyes were first opened in earliest childhood they had before them the vision of an enchanted land.

When we think of Arthur Machen, it is not, as, for example, with Dickens, his 'characters' that we remember, not what so-and-so said or did on such and such an occasion. We think first of descriptions of places, or rather, evocations of the spirit of place, and of the emotions to which they give rise. It is not even the case that ,as with Hardy, we think of his people as inseparable from place, for they are lay figures, mere mouthpieces for the opinions of their author. In Dickens a background, in Hardy a twin protagonist with man, in Machen the spirit of place is the whole drama.

I should put it thus: this group of pines, this lonely shore,

> or whatever the scene may be, has made the soul thrill with an emotion intense but vague in the sense in which music is vague; and the man of letters does his best to realise—rather, perhaps, to actualise—this emotion by inventing a tale about the pines or the sands.

In a sense all Machen's books are one book, and through all runs this one dominant theme, the awe and beauty inherent in the fields and orchards of Gwent, the lonely white farmhouses, the bare domed uplands, the forests and fantastic rocks of that deep country on the borders of Wales. So it is that in thinking of him we remember first his descriptive passages; those occasions when he writes, equally enchantingly, of a 'herb of the fields', or of Twyn Barlwm, 'that mystic tumulus, the memorial of peoples that dwelt in that region before the Celts left the Land of Summer', or when, remembering his horror, as a young man in London for the first time, at the sight of Kensal Green cemetery, 'that ghostly city of corruption', he breaks out into lyrical apostrophe of the graveyards of Gwent:

> Well I knew the old graveyards of Gwent, solemn amongst the swelling hills, peaceful in the shadow of very ancient yews. I knew well these garths. There was Henllis, high up on the mountain side, in the place of roaring winds, under the faery dome of Twyn Barlwm. I had lingered there of autumn evenings while the sun set red over the mountains, and a drift of rain came with the gathering darkness, as the yew boughs beat upon the east window of the church. . . .

Men create landscape, or at least their imagination gives it depth, adds to it another dimension. Except in their pictures, no one at any time has looked upon a hay-wain quite like Constable's, or seen Hastings beach as Turner saw it. How lifeless, how reduced in spiritual stature, seem 'Egdon Heath' or the moors near Haworth to those who saw them first with the mind's eye, and so must inevitably associate them with the sombre magnificence of the *Return of the Native* or *Wuthering Heights*! A similar disillusionment awaits the traveller to the valley of the Usk, who thinks to visit in actuality scenes which Machen's stories, and still more his essay in autobiography, *Far off Things,* have impressed as deeply upon the imagination. Are these pleasant but commonplace fields really the outskirts of fairyland? Is this colourless and insignificant stream the sky-like Usk, 'silvery and luminous, winding in mystic esses' through a 'wonderful and most lovely valley' to the sea? The traveller might as hopefully travel to Baghdad, to find the city of the Arabian Nights.

But it matters little, after all. We do not go to Constable for knowledge of how to make a hay-wain, nor to Machen for the topography of Monmouthshire. By reading these books our appreciation

of all landscape is imaginatively modified, and since landscape is but a symbol, our awareness of beauty also, and our understanding of life itself. Through the medium of art we enter, more directly than by any other means, into communion with another mind.

Notwithstanding Machen's explicit statement, we may say that it was for him an even greater 'piece of fortune' to have been born with a sense of wonder than to have been born in Gwent. For this sense of wonder would have served him as well in Birmingham as by the Usk. Had his eyes first opened in the valley of the Tyne, he would have seen it as a Gwent. He differs from the 'regional' novelist in that it is not a particular countryside that is the real source of his inspiration, nor even the country as opposed to the town. No place on earth, one might suppose, differs so radically from Gwent, or could so constrain the imagination of the lover of Gwent, as London, N.W.; yet, for Machen, "all the wonders lie within a stone's throw of King's Cross". He does not imply, of course, that the mean streets and sham Gothic of this unlovely neighbourhood are literally comparable with the white hill farms of Wales, but only that, properly understood, these, no less than those, are peaks in Darien, and that he who lacks "the faculty of finding infinity round the corner of any street, within five minutes of anywhere", will hardly appreciate at its true value what all agree in calling 'beautiful'. Like Sir Thomas Browne, he could describe his early life[1] as, "a miracle . . . which to relate were not a history, but a piece of poetry". To a mind so impregnated with "a sense of constant wonder latent in all things", a herb of the fields in Gwent is not more sacramental than a hollowed doorstep in Clerkenwell, "signed with tears and desires, agony and lamentation".

In the pages of his autobiography, and particularly in *The London Adventure,* we are as conscious of the presence of the thronging city as of the lonely mountainside; not so much the London of the tourist, as that universe of brick and stone which stretches in all directions beyond the highways—regions charted indeed, but as unexplored, even by the Londoner, and as rich in wonder, as the Arabian desert or the forests of the Amazon.

The sub-title of *The London Adventure* is 'The Art of Wandering', and whether we wander in town or in country, whether our discourse is of life or letters, or follows the paths of pure speculation, we come, with Machen as our guide, to the same conclusion:

[1] Machen held the view that "he who has any traffic with the affairs of the imagination has found out all the wisdom that he will ever know, in this life at all events, by the age of eighteen or thereabouts". It is interesting to find this view confirmed by a contemporary, perhaps the greatest, 'trafficker with the affairs of the imagination'. In the *Trembling of the Veil,* W. B. Yeats wrote, "I am persuaded that our intellects at twenty contain all the truths we shall ever find . . . "

> Strangeness which is the essence of beauty is the essence of truth, and the essence of the world. I have often felt that, when the ascent of a long hill brought me to the summit of an undiscovered height in London; and I looked down on a new land.

* * *

But if we were to choose one work to represent Machen to posterity or to a man from Mars (as we might choose, say, *Hamlet* to represent Shakespeare, or the *Old Wives' Tale* to represent Arnold Bennett), this would not be, as we have said, any one of his stories or novels, from the earliest romances, like the *Chronicle of Clemendy* of 1888, to the latest Penguin collection, *Holy Terrors,* which appeared so recently as 1946; not even such a finely imagined *conte* as *The Great Return,* itself a favourite of the author's, which describes the reappearance of the Holy Grail in modern Wales, and contains some of Machen's most distinguished prose. It would not be any one of the remarkable series of translations from the French, which include the only complete rendering of the *Memoirs* of Casanova, and of the *Heptameron* of Marguerite of Navarre, both done during his early days in London. It would not be, charming though they are, one of those collections of miscellaneous essays—*Dreads and Drolls* or *Dog and Duck*—which wear their learning so lightly; nor such an intimate historical resurrection as *The Canning Wonder* (1925), which is the story of an eighteenth-century trial, told in minute detail and with a literary grace uncommon in historians. Least of all would it be a specimen of such polemical writings as *Dr. Stiggins: His Views and Principles,* which may be thought hard to forgive, and are better forgotten. Our ultimate choice would not even be that autobiographical trilogy—*Far Off Things, Things Near and Far,* and *The London Adventure*—which we have already praised so highly. No, if we are to choose one book to represent this author, so many-sided, but always recognizable under the disguise of the moment, let it be the one which is the key to the full appreciation of the others; I mean *Hieroglyphics.* This short book or long essay, like Keats's sonnet, *On first looking into Chapman's Homer,* might be classed, superficially, as 'literary criticism', but it is essentially, like the sonnet, a criticism of life. For to Machen, as to every true writer, the two are, in the last analysis, indistinguishable. In *Hieroglyphics,* published as long ago as 1902, and written in the cyclical manner favoured by Coleridge (though without his haziness and tendency to split hairs), Machen presents his literary creed. His concern is with the art of writing; but we find, somewhat as in a Platonic dialogue, that in attempting to isolate the secret of literature, what we have really done is to indicate a philosophy of life. Our point of departure is made clear at the outset.

In the words of the 'Hermit of Barnsbury', the Socrates or S.T.C. of the record:

> And now what I want to know is this: here we have a vast body of thought, clothed in words, ranging from [political pamphlets and the evening paper] up to—let us say—the Odyssey, and all this mass is known as literature: What is to be our criterion, our means of distinguishing between the two extremes I have mentioned and all the innumerable links between them? Is the whole mass literature in the true sense of the word? If not, by what rule are we to divide the true from the false, to judge exactly in the case of any particular book whether it is literature or not?

On the page which follows, this question is categorically answered:

> Yes, for me the answer comes with the one word, *Ecstasy*. If ecstasy be present, then I say there is fine literature; if it be absent, then, in spite of all the cleverness, all the talents, all the workmanship and observation and dexterity you may show me, then, I think, we have a product (possibly a very interesting one) which is not fine literature. . . . I have chosen this word as the representative of many. Substitute, if you like, rapture, beauty, adoration, wonder, awe, mystery, sense of the unknown, desire for the unknown. All and each will convey what I mean. . . .

This doctrine (we are too remote from the world of academic criticism to call it a thesis) is then developed with a wealth of illustration and allusion, and, to the last page of the book, with the deep conviction and absence of pomposity which characterize any genuine confession of faith.

There are theories of poetry in plenty, there are specialized works on the origin and evolution of the drama, the novel, and even the essay; but *Hieroglyphics* differs from such things in providing a theory of literature as a whole. For the unacademic mind indeed, for the lover and practitioner, if not for the student, of letters, this essay provides probably the most (I had almost written, the only) satisfying theory of literature as such, a touchstone for the judgment whether of poetry or prose, the drama or the novel, even the critical essay itself[2]. It is that rarity, a book about literature that is itself fine literature. It is a brief but brilliant summary of the sort of doctrine that is hinted at in the *Notebooks* of Coleridge; it is the

2 The writer of Machen's obituary notice in *The Times* says justly that *Hieroglyphics* "has never received the critical attention it deserves". It never will—from the critics. On its appearance it was attacked by *The Times* itself, in the person of A. B. Walkley, and by such influential academic critics as Sir A. T. Quiller-Couch. But it is otherwise with the writers. Mr. Edgar Jepson, the novelist, for example, says (*Memories of an Edwardian*, p. 54), ". . . his theory of Ecstasy has always satisfied me". And the poet, Henry Savage, called the book "a masterpiece of illuminative criticism" that "can never be studied enough by the critic wishful to perfect himself in his art" (*Arthur Machen: A Bibliography*, vii, ix).

sort of book that Coleridge, had he remained a poet, and turned his back on opium and German metaphysics, might have written; the book that he did not write, that great book, the absence of which we must eternally regret. Few, certainly, since Coleridge, have been able to make the perfect comment, at once exact and memorable, upon writing or writers, as Machen does, when, for example, he defines unconscious literary art as the ability "so to tell the bare truth that it seems a magnificent lie"; or speaks of Herodotus "with the odours of the sanctuary of poetry still about him, though he has come down into the market-place of prose"; or describes *Lycidas* as "the very soul set to music".

And the conclusion of the matter? It is that the creation and appreciation of fine literature is akin to religious experience, in that it proceeds from and inspires, awe, reverence, adoration. It is that art is the presentment in temporal symbols of an eternal mystery. There is nothing *new*, be it noted, in the philosophy that underlies this attitude to literature. It may be summed up simply enough in the old scholastic maxim, *Omnia abeunt in mysterium*. But, after all, the old truths remain, still and always, more impressive than the newest lies. Particularly today, when the disciples of Marx would try to cajole or to compel us into believing that man lives by bread alone, when culture tends more and more to be equated with, or at least confused with, civilization—at such a time we cannot too often be reminded that art is not a form of propaganda, that "it proceeds always from love and rapture, never from hatred and disdain", that the function of art is to celebrate the mystery and majesty of life, to praise God and magnify Him for ever. And further, and consequently, that it is the function of criticism to celebrate art, to indicate excellence, to impart enthusiasm, rather than to 'debunk', to ridicule certain 'old masters' because their aims were not our aims, because we do not share, or fail to understand, their sentiments, or simply because they were not interested in politics. From which it follows, that, of the two extreme factions in criticism, though both are to be deprecated, the 'bardolater' is to be preferred to the iconoclast. That he re-states these principles, and gently reminds us, so to speak, that painting did not begin with Picasso, and that literature does not end with James Joyce, but that great art is a great tradition, is not the least of the merits of the author of *Hieroglyphics*.

* * *

As anyone who studied his writings might suppose, Machen lived as thoroughly, and with the same zest, as he wrote. Writing might sometimes be a business: to live was always an art. He was a lover of life and of the good things of life, which he enjoyed, as he enjoyed great literature, to the full. Even his books fail to suggest

completely the extent of his knowledge, or the richness and versatility of his talk. It was not only an occasional dogmatism that caused many of his friends to compare him with Dr. Johnson; nor was it his intimate knowledge of ritual alone that made one friend in particular think of him as the reincarnation of "some great French ecclesiastic of the seventeenth century". He had, besides, the learning without pedantry of the one, and the splendid courtesy that may be supposed to have characterized the other. Like all men with a great appetite for life and a discriminative aptitude for living, though in a particular period, he was never entirely of it. He looked backwards to a more leisurely, a more cultured age. One feels that he would have been as much at home in the eighteenth century as in his own. As a member of Johnson's famous 'Literary Club' he would certainly have cut a greater figure than was possible in the anthill of Edwardian and neo-Georgian London. His satire, too, would perhaps have been less bitter. But he also looked forward: as a writer he is *sui generis*, if anyone is, and the only label that is adequate for Machen is 'Machenesque'.

Mr. Edgar Jepson has spoken of Machen's 'sonorous voice and deep, rich laugh', and of his 'Assyrian presence'. Particularly happy is this last: there is even something cuneiform about his handwriting. The letters of his last years (which always arrived with the stamp placed horizontally) were written in green ink with wide margins in a script as firm and clear and as beautifully characteristic as the MS. of works written forty years earlier. In one of the last of the letters I received from him, dated April 1941, in passing judgment on himself, he expresses the hope that "with good fortune one or two of my books may find a corner beside Peacock and the shorter stories of Sheridan Le Fanu". It is a modest forecast, perhaps too modest. One thinks perhaps of De Quincey, or even of Poe, rather than of Peacock. These writers Machen admired, and like them, he is a writer's writer, remarkable less for breadth than for depth, less for the size of his garden than for the thoroughness of its cultivation. His place in English literature, though a small one, is secure, and we can say of his work, as confidently as of anything written in his day, that it will live to delight and profit many as yet unborn.

THE CHURCH IN THE ATOMIC AGE - II[1]

By H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D.

"Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands, thou has put all things under his feet."

Man's mastery of atomic secrets is only the latest and most impressive reminder that his delegated power over Nature extends far beyond the dreams of the Psalmist. We know that God wants us to use our new discovery for His glory and for the well-being of the race. Yet we are told that it is possible "that by misdirection of atomic energy man can bring earthly history to a premature close."[2]. This is a fearful possibility, and our faith must take it into account. But the close would be "premature" only if earthly history ended before God had finished what He is doing in it. This cannot be. Was the death of the young man Jesus "premature"? No; the evil power was not permitted to touch Him until "all things were accomplished" which God had purposed to work through His earthly life. And God, Who in the Cross of Christ wrought through seeming defeat His crowning victory over evil, is still master of the situation. History will come to an end, but not before "all things have been accomplished". We must believe that, if we are to believe in God at all.

"The end of the world", therefore, is an event of which the Gospel takes full account. The world comes to an end because it is finite and creaturely. Man too is destined to die. But when Christian believers in our blitzed cities went about their duties while the bombs were falling, the faith that sustained them was that their lives were in God's hand. Death might come to them at any moment, but it would not come without God's permission, and whenever it came, God would make it the gateway into fuller life. Christians, facing the certainty of death, do not rest their hope on the natural immortality of the soul, but on the promise and power of God Who raised Jesus Christ from the dead. If we believe that God loves us with an everlasting love; we can be sure that death will not be permitted to pluck us out of His hand. To the individual, death brings the end of the world; and the end of the world brings physical death to the race. Yet the world will not come to an end before it has fulfilled the purpose for which God created it. And what that purpose is, so far as it concerns mankind, individual, death brings the end of the world, and the end of the we know. In the *Epistle to the Ephesians* Paul writes of the

1 The first article under this title appeared in January 1948.

2 *Report*, p. 20 (quoting the American report, *Atomic Warfare and the Christian Faith*).

mystery of the will of God which He has made known unto us in Christ—how that "it was His loving design, centred in Christ, to give history its fulfilment by resuming everything in Him, all that is in heaven, all that is on earth, summed up in Him"[3].

This all-embracing purpose of God, effected in Christ, includes the redemption of mankind. Beyond history it culminates in the heavenly Kingdom of God, the eternal City that "hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it," whose light is the glory of God. Meanwhile, we live in history, and need a faith that will not be extinguished by its bewildering tragedies and tremendous shocks. A Gospel that is to be really good news to historical creatures like us must do more than picture the glories of Eternity; it must give us a clue to the meaning of Time. Showing us the New Jerusalem beyond history, it must also help us to understand the significance of history itself. What, men ask, is God doing in history? The New Testament answers by pointing us to what God has already done there in the incarnation, death and resurrection of His Son. It tells us that in Christ God has restored the divine image that sin defaced in us. In Christ a new Israel arises, the promise and earnest of a new humanity; a chosen, covenanted people that offers to God the true sacrifices of faith and obedience that the old, sinful humanity refuses Him. This new Israel, this *ecclesia* of God, is not only the commissioned apostle of world community, but world community in being. By its corporate life and obedience to the Gospel, it proclaims, more eloquently than by its preaching, that Christ has been raised from the dead by the almighty power of God, and that the new humanity has been born. "For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's"[4]. These words of the Apostle are no rhetorical flourish, but a plain statement of his faith that the clue to history is God's purpose to create in Christ a Church; and that all the tribulations, disciplines, disappointments, and delays, that darken our historical existence, are used by God to chasten His Church and win its repentance, to test and strengthen its faith, to give room for its hope and occasions for its love.

If we are to take this New Testament conception of the Church in all seriousness, what must be said of the Churches we know? The Church of Christ on earth has the ambiguity of a supernatural society that is also a human institution set in a sinful world. The ambiguity is seen even in the Churches of the Apostolic Age. When Paul writes "to the Church of God which is at Corinth", he paints the portrait of a Church riddled with faction, social snobbery, and

[3] *Eph.* 1: 9f. Knox's translation.
[4] 1 *Cor.* 3[21-22].

intellectual pride, and stained with the immorality of the pagan world. These Christians are still carnal, still babes in Christ. None the less, they *are* in Christ, and are a temple of God in which His Spirit dwells. Paul does not exhort his Churches to obedience in order that they may earn the right to be called of God to be Christ's Body, but to walk worthily of their calling, which stands not in their own merits but in the grace of God Who chose them before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blemish before Him. Now this twofold nature of the Church as composed of fallible men and women living in a sinful world and yet as called to be the Body of Christ and the nucleus of a new humanity—this ambiguity, as we have called it—is inseparable from the existence of the Church in history. The perfecting of the Church, and the final annulling of this ambiguity, would mean that history had come to an end; for history will not come to an end as long as the Church has lessons to learn from it. Yet those lessons will be taught by rough teachers—wars, and rumours of wars, tribulations and catastrophes. This is what the Bible says regarding the future of Christ's Church on earth. The very height of its destiny is the measure of the depth of chastening and trial that awaits the Christian community as it seeks to be obedient to its Lord.

II

> If something radical is needed to set the world right, as none can deny, something radical must happen to the Church. To remain content with our present presuppositions and present practice, and to assume, as we often unthinkingly do, that the life and organization of the Church will be much the same in ten, twenty, or fifty years time as they are today, is, whether we admit it or not, to be oblivious to the revolution that is taking place in human society[5].

To the ambiguity of the Church belong not only the failings and the sins of its members but also its *institutions*. To the sociologist, the Church is a human society, with a structure comparable with that of other human societies and subject to the same laws of development. Every one of its institutions has therefore a sociological as well as a theological significance. Let us take an example. Episcopacy is a subject usually discussed in a purely theological context, in which stress is laid upon the identity and continuity of the function of bishops in the Church down the centuries. But from the sociological angle, the bishop who was permanent president of a board of city presbyters in the urban society of the Roman Empire is very different from the bishop who was a great territorial magnate and an officer of State in the feudal

[5] *Report*, p. 82.

society of the Middle Ages. The difference here has no special theological significance, but evidently corresponds to the difference in social structure between the Roman Empire and mediaeval Christendom. It illustrates the way in which the Church has adapted its institutions to changes in the structure of the society to which it ministers. But in the past this adaptation has been largely unconscious, and has been retarded by the natural inertia which the sociologist finds existing in all great organizations and vested interests. Today, for instance, both Anglican and Free Churches in this country have so far failed to adapt their institutions to the rapidly changing social structure. The basic plan of Anglicanism still reflects a pre-industrial England, while that of the Free Churches reflects the Age of *Laissez-faire* and the heyday of the manufacturing middle classes. New institutions, new techniques of Christian witness and evangelism, are called for by the new mass society in which our work must be done.

The institutional side of the Church is that on which it is confirmed to the contemporary social structure. Institutions are indispensable, because the Church must be all things to all men—in the Pauline sense—in order that all men may hear the Gospel. There is nothing treasonable to Christ in institutions as such. A wholly "spiritual" Church, with no institutions, organizations or structure, is as much an impossibility as a wholly "spiritual" Incarnation, and for the same reason. Nevertheless, institutionalism is the gate by which treason enters, and must be guarded, therefore, with the utmost vigilance. The trouble is that this conformity of the Church to society extends beyond the institutions to the ideologies they can so easily express and support. An ideology is a set of religious, ethical and political beliefs that we choose, just as we choose a pair of boots—because they are comfortable. Not that we do this consciously. We think we hold these beliefs because we are convinced of their truth. But the fact is that, because they enable us to go about our business with a minimum of inconvenience, we are prejudiced in their favour and dismiss too readily opposing beliefs or facts that seem to call them in question. To be unconscious victims of an ideology is to be conformed to the world with a vengeance; for now we are taking as the whole truth what is at best no more than a part of it. We have lost the full-orbed Gospel—the only standard that can fix for us the limits of legitimate accommodation to the world. And then we and our Churches are invaded by the spirit of the age. What the sociologist calls the natural inertia of great organizations is in the Church something much worse—unbelief, the apostasy of a timid conservatism that is not willing to venture into untried paths at the command of God. We mistake means for ends, and we identify

the Church of Christ with the institutions we know and in which we have our assured place and prestige. We set up the vested interests of denominationalism. We fall victims to the commercial spirit and measure the success of our Churches by balance sheets and statistics. We become ecclesiastical politicians, and rely more than we ought upon public meetings, manifestoes, lobbying, and stunts. We are out for quick results, because at all costs our Churches must be preserved. Our horizons shrink until the Church of Christ disappears from view behind "our Church". We get up bazaars "to bring the people together", and go from one dubious money-raising enterprise to another "to give them something to work for". This is institutionalism run mad. We are all very busy, but is it the Lord's work we are doing? We are all very earnest, but are we being obedient to Christ?

To say that the Church is not an institution but a fellowship is to sacrifice truth to a neat antithesis. The fact is that the Church is both. It is an institution, because it needs a body and organs of communication with the world. But the institution is a means to an end, and not an end in itself; it exists not for its own sake but for the sake of the Gospel. Even the fellowship is there not for its own sake, but for the sake of the Gospel and as a part of its message to mankind. Though our conferences may have degenerated into ineffectiveness, we can still "enjoy the fellowship", and committees where nothing of importance is ever done can be jolly affairs. But the *koinonia* that is distinctive of the Church of Christ, and manifests itself through institutions as the life of an organism does through its limbs, is not *any* kind of fellowship, however human and hearty, but a fellowship of faith, and of the corporate obedience of responsible believers to their King.

The worst we can imagine about the future that is so swiftly advancing to meet us is not the end of the world, but a series of atomic wars culminating in the subjugation of the nations by a totalitarian State. Democracy would have disappeared; its institutions would have been abolished and the freedoms they expressed and fostered denied us. How would it fare with the Christian Church? Some form of institutional religion might well be preserved by rulers who had the shrewdness to see that the rope of tyranny is all the tougher for a religious strand woven into it. But the ecclesiastical civil service of a totalitarian State is not the Church of Jesus Christ; and obedience to Him would demand that every communion called by His name—whether Catholic or Protestant, episcopal, presbyterian, or independent—should forthwith become uncompromisingly nonconformist. We know what would happen then. The persecutions that fell upon the continental Churches under the Nazi regime would threaten us all. The institutional

side of our Church life would be shattered by the imprisonment or "liquidation" of bishops and pastors, the banning of Church assemblies, and the confiscation of Church property. Our Sunday schools and youth organizations would be proscribed, and our worship, if not made actually illegal, would be accorded only that contemptuous toleration that is tossed to the superstitions of a shrinking minority of elderly people who have no political influence and will soon disappear from the scene.

But how can Caesar triumph where even the gates of Hell shall not prevail? When tyranny has done its worst against the churches, the Church will remain. Driven underground, bereft of leaders, vilified by quislings, and harried by the secret police—the churches by God's mercy will rediscover that "essential Congregationalism" which is not the monopoly of a denomination but the heritage of them all and the principle of their true life. In the little fellowships of the faithful, where religion is no mere customary observance but a costly, perilous, day-to-day obedience to the Lord, the Church will survive, and, surviving, will preserve for generations yet unborn the precious seed of a Christian civilization. Democracy, with its liberties and idealisms, the best thought and culture of the world that died, the humane affections and compassions that seemed to have perished from the earth—all these will survive in the Church's survival, to be re-baptized into Christ and regenerated by His Gospel against the dawn of a better day. In the new Dark Ages the Church will once again be the ark of human hopes, if, caring for culture, democracy, social justice, and all things honourable and of good report, it cares still more for the Gospel, and keeps faith with man because its first loyalty is given to God.

III

The Church will survive, not by reason of the toughness of its institutions, nor by reason of the warmth and power of its human fellowship, nor, indeed, by reason of anything *we* can do or be to save it, but because God will not leave Himself without a Remnant of His faithful ones to praise Him and give Him thanks. But to speak of survival is to use the wrong word. It may well be that the impulse to worship is inextinguishable in the human heart, yet in a world given to idolatry we cannot afford to build our hope on this. There is nothing human that must not pass through death to a resurrection before God can make it perfect for His glory. So it is with our Churches—all-too-human as they are. As we know them, they cannot survive; yet even as we know them, they may be re-born. The worst that can be said about them is not that they are dying, but that they are not willing to die that God may raise them up.

Well may we pray to be delivered from the great tribulation of a totalitarian world. But should we have to pass through it, are our Churches in training for it? Or are we short in wind and flabby in muscle, and altogether out of shape for the race that is set before us? If our Churches are to be gathered in the Remnant that God will raise up to bear witness in an apostate world, must they not, even here and now, be stripped for the contest? Must they not be wholly obedient to Christ?

We spoke of essential Congregationalism—what is that? Not freedom from creeds, nor democratic Church government, nor independence of the State, nor anything in our polity that we can claim as distinctive of a denomination, but *the personal responsibility of the individual believer for the corporate obedience of the Church to its Lord.* Other Churches may have other ways of expressing and living by this principle, but our way is the "Church Meeting", the characteristic and essential organ of our Independent polity. We are often told that the Church Meeting is out-of-date and that it is useless trying to revive it. But under the great tribulation the Church Meeting would be manifestly the most significant gathering in the world. None but believers would attend it, for it would be too unhealthy for the time-servers, the quislings, and all fair-weather Christians. Since its decisions would be no mere paper resolutions but would commit those who made them to immediate and, perhaps, dangerous witness for Christ, no time would be wasted on trivialities, but there would be much prayer and earnest waiting upon God. And would not Christ be there, giving to His servants grace for their need, subduing their egoisms and fears, quickening their faith, reviving their hope, and enlarging their love? Would not believers long for the Church Meeting as hungry men crave for food? And would not the little company seek out other fellowships of Christ's people and rejoice in a common loyalty to Him? Would not the World-Church be for them a far more vivid and vital reality than as yet it is for us?

We said that under the universal tyranny of a totalitarian State the Church Meeting would be the most significant gathering in the world. But that is what it is *now*—if, indeed, it be a real *Church meeting*—the assembling together of pledged believers for worship, witness, and waiting upon God—and not merely the decaying institution of a particular denomination. We have not valued very highly those monthly Church Meetings of ours. Very few of our members come to them, and we are often hard put to it to find enough business to justify asking people to give up yet another evening to attend. Yet when the Church of Christ is really up against it, the Church Meeting suddenly becomes all-important, and not only to Congregationalists, but to Christians whose

ecclesiastical traditions are very different from our own. Perhaps that is why at this moment Continental theologians and Church leaders are eagerly asking us for information about the practice of Congregationalism. Emerging from the bitter experience of Nazi persecution, they see in our despised and neglected Church Meeting an institution precious and indispensable to the health and continued reformation of the Church. Are not we here in Britain up against it, too? How can we complain of lack of business in our Church Meetings when on every side the Church is being challenged by secularism? Have we no concern with the problems raised by the discovery and use of atomic power. Ought not the religious issues with which they confront us to be on our agendas? Have we no concern for the World Church, and nothing to do as individual believers and as Churches to realize and make effective our part in it? In what new ways ought we to be bearing our Christian witness in a mass society where the individual seems to count for less and less, and his personal decisions to become more and more ineffective? What does Christian living mean in terms of a man's economic vocation? Are we all as impotent as we seem to bridge the gulf between work and worship, life and religion? Unless our Gospel is false and our faith a delusion, God has commands for us, relevant to today. Ought we not together to wait upon Him in order that we may learn His will for us? Lack of business!

Too many readers of this article, it is to be feared, will be disappointed and exasperated when, instead of a programme of action obviously relevant to the problems of the Atomic Age, they are offered what appear to be merely a few theological reflections upon the nature of the Church and an exhortation to Congregationalists to take the Church Meeting more seriously. Surely this is to fiddle while Rome is burning! But we are all bound to pay heed to the warning note sounded in the Report:

> To fling ourselves at once into fresh activities might be the surest preventative of the radical inner transformation that the situation demands. We should be acting with our unregenerate minds, and without undergoing the deep inward change that alone can enable us to respond to God's demands. We must accept it as a sign of the gravity of the crisis that we can expect no easy guidance away from disaster[6].

In any case, it is not primarily for the revival of an institution we are pleading. We might make our Church Meetings popular events, with coffee and biscuits and a tastefully printed programme, without being converted to real faith in God and obedience to His will. The Church Meeting can help real church members to walk together in the way of obedience, but real church members are

[6] pp. 79f.

made only through repentance and regeneration—the work of no institution, old or new, but of the Holy Spirit alone. And repentance, let us remember, means not only change of heart but change of mind. It means more than renouncing past infidelities; it means becoming aware of our comfortable illusions and our cherished prejudices and renouncing *them*. It means thinking new and revolutionary thoughts in a re-discovery of the Gospel as the Word of God addressed to us here and now.

The repentance and continued reformation of the Church according to the Gospel, so far from being unpractical and remote from the immediate situation, is God's redemptive purpose not only in this situation but in history as a whole. That is what we meant by saying that the real Church Meeting is the most significant gathering in the world. That mankind should be a community under the gracious sovereignty of Christ the Saviour, in which men of all races and nationalities unite to worship God and obey Him in the freedom of filial trust and the humility of grateful love—is not this the meaning of redemption and the climax of history? And is not the World Church, both in its totality and also in its local manifestations, even at this moment—in spite of all its faults and imperfections and grievous sins—a foreshadowing and earnest of the renewing of mankind?

Though as Churches and believers we are pledged to work for world peace and to support it, yet UNO may fail as the League failed. The New Order of social justice may be still-born because of the selfishness and blindness of Man. The enterprises to which we set our hand, because we believe that they are in line with the will of God, may come to grief. In a world where there is so much to menace us and to darken our hopes, where are we to find the strength to go on when others are falling by the way, and we are tempted to despair? Our sufficiency is of God, Who is King over His world and brings His purposes to pass. Our failure is not His failure, if in our failure we have been obedient to His will. For where faith and love and obedience are, there is His Kingdom, and the promise of the world's redemption.

In *India Called Them* (Allen & Unwin, 18s.), Lord Beveridge has produced an extremely readable record of his mother and father, and a vivid picture of phases of Indian life in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Henry Beveridge, who entered the Indian Civil Service in 1857, and his wife, Annette Akroyd, were, as their letters show, remarkable people. In some things, notably in their views on British rule, they were ahead of their time. But their letters reflect the age in which they lived. For Lord Beveridge, the writing of this volume has been an act of filial piety. Henry Beveridge wrote in 1877: "The history of our Indian empire is pre-eminently that of the actions of ordinary men in extraordinary circumstances". His son might be said to have used that sentence as his text.

H. CUNLIFFE JONES.

THE EARLY CONGREGATIONAL CONCEPTION OF THE MINISTRY AND THE PLACE OF WOMEN WITHIN IT[1]

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the nature of the Church and of the ministry was, spiritually, a question of life and death, a question of salvation, over which men stood sharply divided, with all sides prepared to condemn every other side but their own in determined and pungent language. To the early Congregationalists "our recovery out of popery" and "the reformation of religion" really meant something. Appeals to unbroken continuity with the past meant little, might even mean a spiritual indifference to fresh light which they condemned. If, for instance, it were objected, "That the Bishops of old were the same with these now; Had the same Ordination, & conformed to the same worship" —an argument with which we are still familiar—, it was answered, as in the Axminster Congregational church book:

> That then was the Infancy of Reformation: That which those worthy witnesses did, was wonderfull in their daies; But we are set vpon their shoulders, It hath pleased God to give vnto vs a larger & greater Inspection into the mysteries of the Gospel, & the Things of the Kingdome of Jesus Christ which was hid from them; . . . The present ministery (in the Church of England) I conceive to be A more defiled & polluted ministery, not only because they have resisted greater Light, But also because they have protested against a Reformation; . . . And what shall we say of persons that are arrived to such a degree as to swear against all Reformation?[2]

This passage is the more noteworthy in that its date is not of the more enthusiastic period between 1640 and 1660, but is 1686. It is in keeping with this attitude that men who became members of Congregational churches, if they had previously received episcopal orders, often considered these orders of none effect, because mistaken and wrong. The more charitable among them acknowledged

[1] Abbreviated from a paper read at the Annual Conference of the Society for the Equal Ministry of Men and Women in the Church, at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, on 10th September, 1947.

[2] *Axminster Ecclesiastica* (pubd. 1874), pp. 101 f. I have made frequent use of this account, partly because of its ingenuous and non-controversial nature, and partly because it was published locally and anonymously and has been largely overlooked. There is a copy in Dr. Williams' Library, London. I wish to thank the Librarians of Dr. Williams' Library and of New College, London, for the loan of several rare seventeenth-century volumes.

there to exist among the congregations of the Church of England "the true Churches"—note the plural—"and Body of Christ, and the Ministery thereof a true Ministery". The more vigorous renounced that Church's ordination for themselves as "a false unction", and, if chosen to be ministers of the churches of which they had become members, received a new ordination for the purpose.

That they should adopt such a practice is not surprising, when one realizes the difference between their own conception of ordination and the Anglican. For our direction here, we may consider the chapter in Part II of Thomas Hooker's *Survey of the Summe of Church-Discipline* "wherein the nature of Ordination is discussed". Hooker, who for the last eleven years of his life was the minister of the Congregational church at Hartford in Connecticut, "came to be identified with all the important political and religious movements of the colony"; and this book, which appeared posthumously in 1648, is one "which has largely affected the course of thought in the development of congregationalism in the United States[3]" and more widely.

In this chapter Hooker brings his careful, clear and moderate arguments to the following conclusions. Ordination "doth not give essentials to the outward call of a Minister". It "presupposeth an Officer constituted, doth not constitute; therefore it's not an act of Power, but Order". "Election of the People rightly ordered by the rule of Christ, gives the essentials to an Officer". "Ordination is an approbation of the Officer, and solemn setling and confirmation of him in his Office, by Prayer and laying on of hands", though "the maine weight of the worke lyes in the solemnity of Prayer". Further, "Though the act of Ordination belong to the Presbytery, yet the jus & potestas ordinandi is conferred firstly upon the Church by Christ, and resides in her. Its in them Instrumentaliter, in her Originaliter"; and "in raising and renewing Churches after great apostacies" the Church herself "provides, elects and ordains a Presbytery[4]".

In this statement two points call for special attention. First, election precedes ordination. When Bellarmine expresses himself in the opposite sense, "Dr. Ames seasonably tells him", says Hooker, "he placeth the cart before the horse; . . . ordinationem praeponere vocationi et electioni, est equis praeponere currum". Second, since the church has the right, in the first instance, to ordain the presbytery, although afterwards the presbytery ordains on the church's behalf, the church exists before, and independently of, any ordained ministry. Both these positions are fundamental in the

[3] *Dict. Nat. Biog., s.v.*
[4] *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 59, 66, 74-77 (but the pagination is out of order).

Congregational conception of the Church and ministry. Without a minister, as John Owen writes, the members of a church "cannot come to that perfection and completeness which is designed unto them"; the ministry is necessary to render a church "completely organical"; yet they may "become a church essentially before they have any ordinary pastor or teacher[5]".

So much will be sufficient to show the very considerable dissent of these early Congregationalists from the Anglican conception of the ministry. Just as men who had earlier received episcopal ordination intended to repudiate it by receiving a fresh, presbyteral ordination, so in 1662 many of the ejected ministers could not consent to receive episcopal ordination without repudiating their earlier presbyteral ordination. When in 1664 Seth Ward, recently consecrated Bishop of Exeter, asked John Howe, "Why, pray Sir, what hurt is there in being twice Ordained?", "Hurt, my Lord, says Mr. Howe to him; the Thought is shocking; it hurts my Understanding; it is an absurdity; For nothing can have two Beginnings. I am sure, saith he, I am a Minister of Christ . . . ; and I can't begin again to be a Minister[6]".

Howe and his fellow-sufferers, who preferred persecution to re-ordination, took their ordination seriously. Yet, as has already appeared, and is tersely stated in the Axminster church book:

> Ordination is not essentially necessary to the work of the ministry. The essence of a minister lies in the consent of three wills. The will of God, The will of the people, & the will of the minister; The will of God is declared in the two latter, that is, when a people Agree to elect, the minister agrees to Accept of the call of a people. And Ordination is for order sake[7].

This might appear to reduce the issue to a purely human level; and outside of its proper context the stress on election, which to modern ears is not a religious word, as ordination is, may sound unspiritual and merely democratic in a secular sense. Indeed, so far as election is concerned, Hooker does point for illustration to the aldermen's choice of their mayor. In point of fact, however, it is the too secular, too purely human character of the episcopal ministry to which exception is taken by Dissenters. "This present nationall ministery", say the Axminster Congregationalists, "is not A ministery of Christ's Appoyntment, But it is a ministery of man's Appoyntment[8]".

In considering ordination, important as in its place this is, we

[5] *A Discourse of Spiritual Gifts*, in *Works*, ed. W. H. Goold, iv. 496.

[6] E. Calamy, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Revd. Mr. John Howe*, (1724), p. 39. The passage is quoted by H. Rogers, *Life & Character of John Howe* (1863), pp. 117 f., and by R. F. Horton, *John Howe* (1905 edn.), p. 76, but in neither case with complete accuracy.

[7] *op. cit.*, p. 102.

[8] *ib.*, p. 99.

have not yet, in fact, considered the heart of the matter. For Congregationalists, in obedience, as they believe, both to the New Testament and to their own Christian experience, the essential thing about the ministry is its charismatic nature. Both Hooker and Owen have full discussions of the meaning of the word *charisma,* which more recent scholarship would confirm them in perceiving to be a key-word in the New Testament, as it is also, apparently, a new word, coined by St. Paul to describe the new Christian experience. In the exhortation to Timothy not to neglect the *charisma* which is in him, "the Office", says Hooker, "is not here firstly and primarily intended", but "those spirituall and gracious abilities, which Timothy received by the Spirit", the "gifts and endowments bestowed upon" him, though "with an eye, and certain reference" to his office[9]. Again, in his *Discourse of Spiritual Gifts* Owen points out that the ministry of the church in *Ephesians* 4^{7-16}, "than which", he says, "there is no other place of Scripture wherein at one view the grant, institution, use, benefit, end, and continuance of the ministry is so clearly and fully represented", is entirely in charismatic terms. "Nothing at all can be done", he says, "without these spiritual gifts; and therefore a ministry devoid of them is a mock ministry, and no ordinance of Christ". "To erect a ministry by virtue of outward order, rites, and ceremonies, without gifts for the edification of the Church, is but to hew a block with axes, and smooth it with planes, and set it up for an image to be adored". Yet, he continues, "it is concerning this outward order that all the world is filled with disputes, about the call of men unto the ministry; which yet, in truth, is of the least concernment therein; for whatever manner or order be observed herein, if the things before mentioned be not premised thereunto, it is of no validity or authority[10]".

That this emphasis in theory upon spiritual gifts as the one essential in the Christian ministry was an emphasis observed also in practice appears from the way in which the Axminster Congregationalists chose Stephen Towgood as their minister in 1679. "Though he was but young in years", the church book records, "yet such were his Ministeriall Gifts & Abilities as did render him more like an Old Disciple & an Aged Minister of Christ. . . . The Church having had a Tast of his spirit, his gifts, & graces, the hearts of the people were soon knitt to him, and the major part of this Congregation were Inclin'd to give him a Call to the Pastorall Office amongst them[11]", which in due course they did. Vocation and election, that is to say, which precede ordination, are themselves preceded by perception of spiritual *charismata,* a perception which is itself a

9 *op. cit.*, p. 55.
10 *op. cit.*, pp. 487, 491, 494 f.
11 *op. cit.*, pp. 60 f.

charisma dependent on the presence of Christ by His Spirit. "I acknowledge", says Owen, "that some begin to talk as if they owned no other presence of Christ but by the word and sacraments; whatever else remains to be done lies wholly within ourselves. It is acknowledged that the Lord Christ is present in and by his word and ordinances; but if he be no otherwise present, or be present only by their external administration, there will no more church-state among men ensue than there is among the Jews, who enjoy the letter of the Old Testament and the institutions of Moses". "Whereas preaching of the word and the right administration of the sacraments are assigned as the notes of a true church", he says, "if the outward acts and order of them only be regarded, there is nothing of evidence unto this purpose in them[12]". It is the presence of Christ by His Spirit, it is "the gifts of the Spirit of Christ[13]", as John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers, had said earlier, which constitutes the church.

The ministry which we have been considering so far has been the regular, permanent, settled ministry, the "stated ministry", as it was called. In this the early Congregationalists were at one with their brethren in the Reformed Churches on the Continent, in observing a threefold ministry of pastors, elders and deacons. Within this framework of the stated ministry it seems hardly to have occurred to them that a place might be found for women. I know of no case of a woman pastor, elder or deacon in any congregation. I know of no case where such a thing is even mooted as a possibility. They accepted the position tersely stated in 1595 by the great Puritan William Perkins, that "publike teaching is flatly forbidden to a woman". Baptism, equally, according to Perkins, as "a seale of the covenant in the publike ministery, and so a part thereof . . . may not be administred by women, who are not allowed to preach; no not in the time and case of necessitie when men are wanting[14]".

In the late sixteenth and in the early seventeenth century, however, there was much activity outside the regular, stated ministry, which contributed much to religious life, and which cannot be left out of account in any real understanding of the ministry of the time. Most important for our purpose are the 'prophesyings', which were observed by Puritan congregations within the Church of England from 1571 onwards, as they were also in Holland and, according to John Robinson, in "all reformed churches". If I may abbreviate what I have written elsewhere[15], these 'prophesyings',

[12] *op. cit.*, pp. 500 f.
[13] *Works*, ed. R. Ashton, iii. 428 f.
[14] W. Perkins, *Works*, ed. T. Pierson (1631), iii. 314.
[15] cf. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Blackwell, 1946), ch. v ("The Spirit and 'Prophesyings' "), with full references.

taking their rise from a study of New Testament worship and from a deep conviction of the Holy Spirit's presence and activity in men's hearts, began as a merely clerical exercise, confined largely to the exposition of Scripture, in which the ministers sat round and in turn interpreted a text, with testimony and exhortation. In Holland, however, by 1571, in the English Separatist churches there at the turn of the century, and in the Congregational churches in England in the 1640's, not only the ministers but "the very common people" were admitted to take part in the exercise, "any private man of the flock" or "any stranger whom they take to be gifted" being at liberty "publickly to expound and apply the Scriptures, to pray and blesse the people".

This 'prophesying' by lay people *ex tempore,* according to the measure of their *charismata,* in dependence on the direct movings of the Holy Spirit, can be regarded in various ways. Psychologically, it is of a piece with the extra-parochial week-day lectures on religious subjects and with the whole-day public disputes which were common: it released some of the absorbing emotion which so many at this time felt for religion and which burst the bounds of more conventional church services. Socially, it was part of the contemporary movemnt towards equality and democracy, was a laicizing of the ministry. Religiously, it was a manifestation of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, and of the conviction that the Holy Spirit worked immediately in all men's hearts. However we regard it, it is of fundamental importance for any imaginative recreation of the religious life of the time.

The next step, as one might expect, was for such 'liberty of prophesying' to be extended to women. The exercise depended on the leadings of the Spirit, and the Spirit knew no bounds of sex differences. At first, women organized 'prophesyings' on their own account and in separation from men. The *cause célèbre* is that of Anne Hutchinson in Boston, New England, who "kept open house for all comers, and set up two Lecture dayes in the week, when they usually met at her house, threescore or fourscore persons". "After she had repeated the (Sunday) Sermon, she would make her comment upon it . . . ; the custom was for her Scholars to propound questions, and she (gravely sitting in the chaire) did make answers thereunto". At her trial for not discontinuing these meetings, at which the doctrines taught were not acceptable to the authorities, she made a bold stand. She agreed that "if I took upon mee a publick Ministery, I should break a rule, but not in exercising a gift of Prophecy". She claimed that she began with but five or six, and it was not her fault or responsibility if the meeting grew. St. Paul's refusal to allow a woman to teach she interpreted as "meant of teaching men". "If God give me a spirit of Prophecy" she urged,

"I may use it"; and pointed with some cogency to the "daughters" included in Joel's prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit, and also to the part taken by Priscilla in instructing Apollos. Her male opponents, not content with alleging that "shee brought forth . . . thirty monstrous births or thereabouts at once", banished her, and six years later, to their evident satisfaction, she was murdered by Indians[16].

Mrs. Hutchinson's fate did not deter other women from following her example. Throughout the seventeenth century it seems clear that women's 'prophesying' was a feature and recognized part of the full diet of worship in many churches, if still always outside the framework of the regular ministry. In the 1640's there is evidence that in Congregational churches in London women were given liberty to 'prophesy' even among men, in a mixed congregation. The Duchess of Newcastle's amusement in one of her *Social Letters* published in 1664—"first, the minister expounds the Scripture, and then the women-hearers expound the sermon"—would have had no point, did it not reflect a fairly widespread practice. As late as 1683 John Bunyan wrote a tract entitled *A case of conscience resolved, viz. whether, where a church of Christ is situate, it is the duty of the women of that congregation ordinarily, and by appointment to separate themselves from their brethren and so to assemble together to perform some parts of divine worship, as prayer, &c., without their men: and the arguments made use of for that practice examined.* Bunyan had not forgotten, perhaps, the effect on his own soul in earlier days of those "three or four poor Women sitting at a door in the Sun, and talking about the things of God", who "spake as if Joy did make them speak" and "as if they had found a new World[17]".

Among men, this practice of 'prophesying' led further to what is now called lay preaching, what then, in recognition of the exercise's charismatic basis, was termed preaching by 'gifted brethren'. Between 1641 and 1652 the question whether or not those who had not been ordained might yet preach on occasion from pulpits was a major subject of controversy, Presbyterians being against, and Congregationalists and Baptists being in favour of, such liberty. For the Presbyterians Thomas Hall publishd in 1651 *The Pulpit Guarded by XVII Arguments.* One of these arguments is the *reductio ad absurdum,* as he considered it: if gifted brethren may preach, why may not women? The Baptist Thomas Collier, in his reply of the same year, *The Pulpit-Guard Routed,* was content to dismiss this as a *non sequitur.* The Congregationalist John Robinson, in an earlier

[16] (T. Welde), *A Short Story of the Rise, reign and ruine of the Antinomians* (1644), Pref. & pp. 31-37.
[17] *Grace Abounding,* sect. 37 f.

controversy with John Yates, who had objected to 'prophesying' altogether, partly because of its dangers where women were concerned, had pointed to the woman who "preached unto the Samaritans the same Word of God in a measure also, and that as truly and effectually, as ever Mr. Yates did to his parishioners, though she went not up into a pulpit as he does". But Robinson had been content to conclude that "a woman may lawfully teach out of the church to the begetting of faith, as this woman did, but not in the church, because she is a woman by sex[18]".

Time had gone on since Robinson wrote, and in these later years of religious enthusiasm there were, in fact, several women who set up as itinerant public preachers. Mrs. Attoway and Hannah Trapnel are the best known, but references to others accumulate. These women tended, no doubt, to be hysterical tub-thumpers rather than preachers moved by God's Spirit, and may be considered unworthy of attention. Yet, along with the women who wrote controversial literature of the calibre of Katherine Chidley's *Ivstification of the Independant Chvrches* (1641), they have their places as examples of a larger activity assumed by women in the ministry of the Church than at any time since, until our own day.

The fullest contemporary discussion known to me of the place of women in the church is a whole chapter devoted to it in the second book of the Congregationalist John Rogers' volume entitled *Ohel or Beth-shemesh. A Tabernacle for the Sun; or Irenicum Evangelicum*. This work he published in 1653 "for the benefit of all Gathered Churches, more especially in England, Ireland and Scotland"; it has been described as "written from the normal independent standpoint[19]". The purpose of the chapter in question is to show "That in the Church all the Members, even Sisters as well as Brothers, have a right to all Church-affairs; and may not only implicitely but explicitely vote and offer or object, &c". To establish his thesis that women have equal liberty and privileges with men in the Church he refers not only to the New Testament and to the Fathers but to many earlier and contemporary English and Continental writers as well. In Dublin, where he had ministered to the Congregational church then meeting in Christchurch Cathedral, "we were wont", he says, "to call over their names one by one, as well as mens". For the present, he is not concerned, he says, for their liberty to preach publicly; but he points to Mary Magdalene as "the first Preacher of Christs Resurrection", reminds his readers that the Iberi (the modern Georgians) were converted by the preaching of a woman, and, with a hand printed in the margin to show where his sympathies lie, says, "I do verily beleeve that handmaids

[18] *op. cit.*, iii. 317 f.
[19] *Dict. Nat. Biog., s.v.*

shall prophesy, and have more publick liberty than now they have''.

From the foregoing it will be apparent that in many Congregational churches there existed side by side a permanent ordained ministry *ex officio,* in which women took no part, and a temporary unordained ministry *ex dono,* in which they did take part. Since a charismatic basis was explicitly sought, and claimed, for both ministries equally, it is remarkable that there seems to have been no perception of the inconsistency of admitting women to the one ministry but not to the other. Presumably it was largely reasons of a social nature which prevented not only men but women themselves from even considering whether women might not on occasion be pastors, elders or deacons. Hooker, in permitting women to speak occasionally at church meetings, as, for instance, ''to give in testimony of repentance, in case they were censured, and came to be restored again'', records his experience that in some cases ''their shamefac't modesty and melanchollick fearfulnesse is such, that they are not able to expresse themselves in the face of a Congregation[20]''. This may well have been the case more generally and have a wider application.

We may conclude by a glance looking back to the first days of Christianity, as described by Vernon Bartlet.

> In so far as Spirit qualification for any ministry was self-authenticating . . . it was above the need of being ratified by formal Church recognition and setting apart, as in ordination . . . 'Charismatic' persons received their call, with and in their gift, direct from God. The Church could recognize or reject its genuineness: it could do no more. . . . What was 'in the Spirit' was on a super-human and so super-conventional level, where the principle 'in Christ there is neither male nor female' had full sway. . . . It over-ruled even the Jewish custom and prejudice against women playing a public part along with men[21].

Only as the charismatic basis was overlaid were women gradually excluded from the ministry: in Syria in the late third century, in Anatolia in the late fourth century, women still had a part in the ministry of the Eucharist[22].

The early Congregational conception of the ministry, with the place of women within it, was thus, at the least, interestingly 'in line' with the New Testament conception. May we not, rather, claim that a fearless recovery of New Testament conviction and experience led naturally to a fresh expression of New Testament principles and practice?

[20] *op. cit.*, pt. III, p. 6.
[21] *Christianity in History*, ed. J. V. Bartlet & A. J. Carlyle, pp. 294 f.
[22] cf. *op. cit.*, p. 322.

THIS FELLOWSHIP BUSINESS

AN ACCOUNT OF AN EXPERIMENT

By CHARLES H. GAY

I WANTED to stand up and shout, "You're wrong!" But I couldn't. I didn't really know.

Let me explain.

It started with a difference of opinion between some church-members. One of them became so offended that he stayed away from Church altogether. I went to see him and found him very disgruntled and full of complaints against other members. I was not really surprised at his attitude; other parsons must have met the same sort of thing. What did strike me as strange, coming from a church-member, was his repeated assertion that there was more fellowship in a pub than in a Church.

I was to hear that phrase again, fairly soon. This time it came from a member of H.M. Forces. I was in close touch with many of these, both church-goers and non-church-goers. I used to meet them in their camps. Naturally I invited them to the services at the Church. Some came, others did not. One put me off with almost the same phrase as that used by the disgruntled church-member. "No, I don't think I'll come. Churches are a bit 'stuffy'. I can really find more fellowship in the pubs".

Again I heard the same argument from a member of our Young People's Society, a girl of about sixteen. We had been holding a social evening. A radiogram had been used for dancing and was still playing while we were having refreshments and talking. One of the company asked, "Need we have the radiogram on now?" "No," replied someone else, "turn it off, it's too much like the atmosphere of a pub".

At once he was taken up. "What's wrong with the atmosphere of a pub? I've never been in one, but I'd love to go. They sound jolly places to me. I'm sure they are much more friendly than the Churches".

There it was. Three times within a fortnight. The same argument—that there was more fellowship in a public house than in a Church. In my very bones I felt it was not so. That is why I wanted to stand up and shout, "You're wrong!" But I couldn't. I didn't really know.

It was that which made me try the experiment. I felt I *ought* to know. I made up my mind to find out for myself how much truth there was in these continued declarations.

Of course I realized that if the experiment was to be of any use it was no good my going as a parson. So I wore a collar and tie instead of a clerical collar and stock. I also realized I should have to go outside my own district. There were public houses enough near at hand, but to go to these places would be of little use for my purpose. I should probably meet some people I knew, and I wanted to try this business from the standpoint of a stranger; for that was the real charge against the Church—that it is the stranger who fails to get a welcome. So I went far afield, disguised in collar and tie.

Come, come, come and make eyes at me
Down at the Old Bull and Bush . . .

Leaving out the "making eyes" part, I accepted the invitation of that old song, and travelling to Hampstead, sought fellowship at "Ye Old Bull and Bush".

There were three bars, joined together like three sides of a square, making three rooms. You can see into the other two rooms from any one of them over the top of the bar. The place was crowded. In the room where I was there were about fifty people. There were a few tables and seats for about twenty. (That was one of the things that struck me about the places I visited—the inadequacy of the seating accommodation.) In one room there was a pin-table; in another, a dartboard; in the third, another pin-table. Nothing else by way of amusement. No piano that I could see, or wireless set.

The crowd was divided into groups—twos and threes, as they came in. There was no mixing. In numbers men and women were about equal. About a quarter of the company were members of the Forces. The majority were fairly young, mostly young couples. There were about six people who seemed to be entirely on their own.

Now, I thought, for the fellowship of the pub. But there wasn't any. No one group spoke to another group. The six solitary ones were left severely alone. It was as orderly and clique-ish as any teashop. People came in, had their drinks, talked to their own companions, and then went out.

For the first quarter of an hour I stood in the middle of the room leaning against a pillar. After that one of the lonely ones went out and I sat in his chair. I was in that place for half an hour and nobody spoke to me. Not even the barmaid. I asked for a small beer and she just planked it down on the counter with my change without a word. No one said he was pleased to see me, no one said good-bye when I left, no one asked me to come again. Not one word of greeting; not one sign of fellowship.

I took a walk over the Heath, making a note of these things, and later entered another famous public house, "Jack Straw's Castle", on the Spaniards Road.

Here there were about forty people. There were about six

sitting at little mushroom seats at the bar, the rest were standing. Leading out of the saloon was a lounge, looking very comfortable, with little tables and wicker chairs, enough for about thirty people. This room was full. Most people came in, had a look at the lounge, realized that there was no chance of a seat, and stood up in the saloon.

I left after about twenty minutes. I was tired of standing. Again I could see no sign of fellowship, not even of amusement. Only one sentence was spoken to me in "Jack Straw's Castle". When I asked for some beer and sandwiches the barmaid enquired, "Mild or bitter?"

One who shared knowledge of this experiment, but who knows no more about public houses than I do, suggested that I ought to go to smaller places, where it was more likely that the same customers assembled each evening. Agreeing that perhaps I had gone to the wrong places for my experiment, I paid a visit, at a later date, to a small suburban district, some fifteen to twenty miles from London.

Here I visited four public houses and my first experience was confirmed. The places were full, there were few amusements, the seating accommodation was still inadequate. In one sense there *was* more of the spirit of fellowship, for the various groups seemed to know one another and there was at times a little back-chat between them. But for the stranger—nothing.

Two things I noticed on this visit. One was the number of notices displayed in some of the houses. In one there was a notice to the effect that all dogs must be on leads. (There weren't any dogs.) In the same house another notice gave warning that anyone found passing betting slips would be asked to leave. A third notice read: "Ladies and Gentlemen will not, others *must* not, steal my glasses".

The other noticeable thing was that the time-honoured warning, "Time, gentlemen, please", seems to be out of fashion. At least, all I heard at closing time was, "Come along, please, the very last. All over, come along, please".

And so my experiment was over. I had visited six public houses. I had looked in vain for *more* fellowship in a pub than in a Church. I admit—and this is important—I admit that I had not made any particular effort myself. That was my purpose. I decided to behave like an average visitor to a Church who comes in either just before or during the first hymn, sits in the back seat, sneaks out immediately the Benediction has been pronounced, and then complains that no one spoke to him.

But while I did not make any particular effort myself, I *did* give others a chance. I *did* hang about. I stood in the middle of the room at "Ye Old Bull and Bush" for a quarter of an hour. I

sat down with others when I had a chance to sit down. In spite of that, no one made any friendly approach.

This is not to say there is *no* fellowship in the pubs. There is. But only for those who take it there—for a few friends who have agreed to meet there or for a young couple who turn in after an evening walk. But they were in fellowship before they entered. On those lines there is fellowship. But then, there is fellowship *anywhere* if you take it with you. I am convinced that there is at least as much chance of 'being spoken to' in a Church (with all its faults) as in a pub, especially if you are a stranger.

One thing the experiment has done for me: It has strengthened my conviction by knowledge and experience. I am longing for the day to come when some innocents, young or old, outsider or church-member, shall begin talking to me about there being more fellowship in the pubs than in the Churches. How I shall enjoy handling them!

Whatever it might be to certain political theorists, the mid-nineteenth century was by no means a paradise for physical sufferers. When Lister was appointed to the Chair of Surgery in Glasgow in 1860 conditions in the local hospital were incredible. Out of every ten patients who underwent an operation involving amputation eight died, victims of septic disease. That present-day conditions are vastly improved is due in no small measure to the labours of one surgeon. In *Joseph Lister: Father of Modern Surgery* (Harrap, 10s. 6d.) Miss Rhoda Truax relates the story of a triumphant fight against ignorance, prejudice and high mortality rates. Born in 1829, Lister lived to see his discoveries incorporated in the everyday practice of surgery. Although honours were showered upon him, he retained the simplicity of his Quaker upbringing and readily gave credit to the work of other men. He acknowledged his debt to Pasteur, and helped to secure recognition for the work of the tragic Semmelweis. But his constant helper and greatest inspirer was his wife, Agnes Syme.

The Lloyd Georges have not been particularly well served by their biographers. Mr. Sylvester's recent volume is singularly unflattering to David Lloyd George. *Dame Margaret: The Life of His Mother* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), by Viscount Gwynedd (now Earl Lloyd George), comes into a different category. But one is conscious of an opportunity missed. Had a chronological sequence been followed, the disjointedness, which the author seeks to excuse, might have been avoided. The book contains some charming descriptions of family life, and a few good stories.

From Lord Elton comes a wholly delightful essay. *Such is the Kingdom* (Collins, 6s.) has several features which, in conjunction, make it unusually significant. First, it is that rarity—a book in praise of humility written without a trace of *hubris* or unction. Secondly, its outlook is homiletically refreshing, *e.g.*, in its insistence that the teaching of Wordsworth on childhood, as exemplified particularly in his ode, *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*, is confirmed by the New Testament, not *vice versa*. Thirdly, its subject-matter is treated with a practicality not always achieved by writing on so lofty a theme.

H. Cunliffe Jones.

PASTOR AND PEOPLE

[Articles in this series deal with pastoral problems, which confront ministers in the course of their ordinary work. We invite readers to suggest subjects.]

"OUR INNER CONFLICTS"

By John G. McKenzie, M.A., D.D.

The heading of this article is the title of Dr. Karen Horney's latest volume. She is one of the writers on character-psychology more helpful to ministers than many who are more widely known. It is her point of view that I wish to use here. Acknowledging how much our knowledge of abnormal psychology owes to Freud she nevertheless strikes out on a course of her own in such volumes as *New Ways in Psycho-analysis, The Neurotic Personality of Our Time, Self-analysis,* and the above-titled volume.

Fundamentally her position is that all neurotic trouble begins in some situation in which the child, adolescent or adult experiences a sense of insecurity. That sense of insecurity gives rise to a state of basic anxiety; and as a reaction to the basic anxiety mental processes are set a-going whose purpose is to defend us against the sense of insecurity or the basic anxiety. These mental processes may create what she calls 'neurotic character-trends' such as 'the neurotic need for affection', 'the neurotic need for a partner', 'the neurotic need to restrict one's life within narrow limits', 'the neurotic need for personal admiration', and many others. In other words, Dr. Horney believes that what we must look for and help to correct are character-structures of a morbid kind if we are to set an individual on the way to acquiring a stable personality free from morbid fears and neurotic behaviour-tendencies.

It will help us to understand this new outlook upon human behaviour if I give some illustrations of these neurotic character-trends which hinder the development of a strong and stable personality.

We are all familiar with the individual who *likes to be liked,* and who cannot bear any adverse criticism. He falls in with anything suggested; he has no opinions of his own; he is uncomfortable in any company where some argument arises because to take sides is contrary to his whole make-up which is to be pleasing to everybody. He hates a row, and he has no capacity to assert himself. He cannot bear the disapproval of others, and any hostile criticism makes him miserable and depressed for days. Naturally such an individual's behaviour and his emotions are wholly determined by what others

will think of him. As Karen Horney puts it: his "centre of gravity is in others and not in self, with their wishes and opinions the only thing that counts". That is the individual with a neurotic need for affection.

Curiously enough such a one may be charming but his personality is always insipid. If he marries it is nearly always to a woman of the motherly sort with a domineering streak in her. She treats him more like a child than a husband, orders him to bed on the slightest sign of illness, and is not averse to fighting his battles for him.

Dr. Jung has familiarized us with the idea that the manifest character-trends of our conscious personality have, as a rule, their opposite counterparts in the unconscious. That is eminently true of the man with a neurotic need for affection. The repressed masculine tendencies of the personality react to the compulsive tendency to be pleasing and yielding to others with resentment. Unconsciously he hates being treated like a child by his wife, hates the fact that he is taken for granted by others and his opinions ignored when he has the courage to express any. In reality he hates himself.

When we get to the phantasies and dreams of individuals of this type we find that they are compensations for the weakness of the conscious character. One meek and mild individual, whose foreman at work was of the domineering type, confessed that he had spent hours rehearsing in his mind the independent and masculine reaction he would make the next time the foreman criticized him. Alas! Instead of this masculine reaction, at the slightest criticism he was off work with a bilious attack accompanied by migraine. A young adolescent of this type brought me many dreams in which he was the hero of stirring exploits.

People of this type are liable to hysterical illness (Conversion Hysteria) which manifests itself in physical symptoms. Sometimes the illness is their way of punishing relatives, especially wife, for lack of that tenderness and love; sometimes it is an escape from the harsh world which will not treat them as nice children; sometimes an unconscious way of getting the attention and fuss which they got as children when ill. Unfortunately we are apt to associate hysteria only with women; but it is just as prevalent among men. One man who had retired early from this 'harsh world' of business was most delighted at first to do a good many chores for his wife; his children were not very old, one of them was still at school. As the children grew up he thought he was being taken for granted and that he would not be missed. All this got repressed. He fell ill, lost weight and sleep, and developed stomach pains for which the specialist could find no organic reason whatsoever. Under analysis his neurotic need for affection soon came to the surface. His illness was

an unconscious attempt to get the fuss and attention generally received in illness. Alas! It did not turn out that way. When the specialist could find no organic trouble his family just told him there was nothing wrong with him and he got no sympathy.

Another one was much more fortunate. He married a different type of wife and when he fell ill his wife went and worked for him! He got so ill that he could not walk without support. Both of these had to learn painfully the cause of their trouble, and, with a better understanding of themselves and their conflicts and a firmer grip on their religious faith and reliance upon God, both are well.

Often this type lose their symptoms if their environment is changed to suit their weakness. The man who got bilious attacks was taken into one of the best hospitals for observation and kept for a month. Not a sign of biliousness or migraine appeared while he was there; in fact he was one of the brightest patients the hospital ever had. He was not a fortnight home when the weary round began again.

Under analysis his attacks were correlated with fear of disapproval and his dread of hostility and any untoward happenings at home, and now he can nearly correlate early symptoms with what has happened throughout the day, and thus is able to ward off any serious attack.

In such cases the exploration of childhood memories and experiences is valuable only because it helps us to understand why the neurotic trend for affection was acquired. The cure, however, lies in correlating attacks with the incidents of daily life to which the attacks are the reactions. The character-trends have to become conscious to the individual concerned; the neurotic need for affection corrected; the repressed masculine qualities have to become consciously active and integrated with the adult personality. The whole trouble is the outcome of the conflict between the neurotic trend and the natural push of the personality to realize itself as an independent, self-conscious and harmonious whole.

This neurotic need for affection often expresses itself in what Karen Horney calls 'the neurotic need for a partner'. In other words it may be confined to one's relations with the opposite sex. It is seen in the adolescent girl with a compulsive drive to get a boy. She *must* get a boy and she worries herself to death if either she cannot get one or if she fails to hold the boy who has taken her out for an evening or two and then dropped her. The seeking to be loved is the be-all of an adolescent afflicted with this behaviour-tendency.

But is it not natural that an adolescent boy or girl should think of a sweetheart? Yes, it is perfectly natural. It becomes neurotic and unnatural if the tendency to seek the love of the other sex becomes compulsive, if the idea of a sweetheart preoccupies the

mind to the exclusion of all other healthy interests. It then conflicts with and frustrates the realization of the personality as a whole.

Perhaps it will be well here to differentiate between normal love and neurotic love, between the natural basic need for affection and the neurotic need for affection.

The natural need for affection is one of the fundamental needs of personality. Although it is correlated with sex it is neither created by sex nor is it dependent on that appetite. It is rooted in the psychological fact that personality and happiness are realized within the sphere of personal relationships. The first need of a child is to have a sense of security in the love of the mother. If the child has this security in her affection it responds with affection. Hence normal love is a two-way traffic: the love of mother (and later the love of father and other members of the family) goes out to the child and the child responds with affection. There is a need in the child to be loved; but there is also the need to love in return. Love is like the sense of touch, it is both active and passive. The child has pleasure in the mother's manifestations of affection; happiness comes in the response to that affection.

The neurotic need for affection is, on the other hand, a one-way traffic. It is a need to be loved, fussed and to receive tenderness. Unlike the normal need for affection, which finds its satisfaction in the response to love by love, the neurotic is wholly taken up by the need to be loved. It is utterly selfish. Any response the neurotic makes is an anticipation of love and tenderness to come. True love, like the love of a mother for an infant babe, is *object-centred;* it is motivated by the needs of the loved one. The neurotic response to love is *ego-centred:* it is motivated by its own want for affection, its own moods, its own desires. It lives in the love that comes in, not in the love that goes out. My readers may remember the verse:

> It is better to live at the fountain's birth
> Than a sea of waves to win;
> To live in the love that goeth forth
> Than the love that cometh in.

The finest analysis of object-centred love is to be found in the thirteenth chapter of *I Corinthians*. No psychologist has bettered that.

Let us get back for a moment to the adolescents who are dominated by this neurotic need for a partner or the affection of one of the opposite sex. One characteristic mark of all neurotic symptoms is indiscriminateness. This is very obvious in the neurotic need for a partner. Any boy will do, any girl will fill the rôle, as long as either give the love and tenderness. Anyone who has this neurotic trend is always looking for someone who *will make him or her happy*. True love between the sexes is characterized by the

desire to make the partner happy. It is object-centred. The perfect marriage is achieved when both partners are object-centred in their love for each other; each is consciously and unconsciously seeking to make the other happy. It is thus a two-way traffic; there is love and the response with love. It is in the response of love that happiness is found. When the thrill and romance of married life go it is because the response of love has gone. It is so in religion. We all know that God loves us; but it is in our response to His love that religious happiness is found.

This neurotic need for a partner actually frustrates the desire for love; it inhibits the natural response of love to love; and very often makes impossible the getting of a mate. The healthy-minded adolescent boy or girl soon senses that the other is not really giving a response in love, and naturally the affair is broken off. On the other hand, should marriage be effected the neurotic partner makes such demands upon the other partner that the marriage is a failure. One woman of this type whom I treated got into such a state that she could not bear her husband out of her sight, and actually a woman had to be paid to stay with her until her husband got back from work. To get his love and sympathy all sorts of pathological symptoms were produced.

Unfortunately the girl with this compulsive tendency to get a boy will pay any price for him, and that often means tragedy.

What I want to get home in this article is that the pastor must learn to discern these neurotic character-structures. We must get rid of the idea that all maladjustments to life or neurotic trouble are due to 'complexes'. There are people who do suffer from the result of having some kind of complex; such people may have obsessions, phobias, fear of going out alone, habits difficult to overcome. A complex is the outcome of some particular experience or repressed memory. If we get at the repressed experience or memory and make it conscious the symptoms disappear. Not so when the maladjustment is due to a character-structure. The very character of the individual has to be changed, and that is often a long job.

Especially is it necessary to understand character-structures in those who exhibit what are now called 'psycho-somatic' symptoms, *i.e.* symptoms which have a physical basis but which would not have appeared had there been no psychological upset. I once had a man to see me who had been off work with 'nervous dyspepsia'. The doctor diagnosed a 'locus of affection' which had lit up but which would have cleared up quite easily had there been no psychological trouble. I found that he lost a good Government job three months previously owing to reduction of staff. He was given a job in another ministry department but with a much inferior status, less freedom, and much smaller salary. His stomach, he said, refused

to digest his food. Actually it was his mind that was refusing to 'stomach' the change in occupation. Looking for character-structures I soon found that he had what has been called the *martyr-habit;* it was always he who had to be sacrificed and always he who had to do the sacrificing: he was the only one to look after his mother, *etc., etc.* A volume like *Psychology in General Practice,* edited by Alan Moncrieff, will give the minister a capital insight into the morbid character-structures of those who get stiff necks, rheumatism of the non-arthritic type, peptic ulcer and all sorts of visceral troubles.

Although I have dwelt mainly on The Neurotic Need for Affection in this article, it is not to be thought that all maladjusted or neurotic individuals have this morbid structure. It is true that a good many neurotic troubles and failures to adjust to life are connected with this particular distortion of the normal need for affection, and indeed that original thinker, the late Dr. Ian Suttie, contended that all neurotic troubles had their roots in the 'fear of the loss of love'. Most psychologists, although acknowledging the value of Suttie's contribution, cannot accept the theory as an explanation of all departures from the normal. There are other fundamental needs of the personality which are just as decisive in determining neurotic structures besides the need for affection. We have the natural and fundamental need for moral unity in our lives. Any conscious or unconscious attempt to live with a moral contradiction in our souls will quickly bring neurotic symptoms. We have also a fundamental need to maintain our social status and self-respect. If either of these are threatened by behaviour tendencies difficult to control there will be conflict and the conditions set up for morbid character-structures to be acquired, such as a relentless driving for perfection or the compulsive tendency to restrict our lives within narrow limits. What we have to understand is, not merely some dissociated complex originating in early childhood experience that generated fear or hostility, but an individual as a whole and the character-structures of that individual. Character-structures of a morbid kind are acquired as a reaction to the whole social situation in which a child is brought up or in which an adolescent or adult is living today. A complex manifests itself in some particular situation as for example a fear of closed places, a fear of hurting someone whom we love, a fear of going out alone; whereas a morbid character-structure affects our reactions to life in many different situations. As pastors we need a knowledge of the anatomy of character if we are to minister to what Dr. J. A. C. Brown titles his splendid little volume in 'The Thinker's Library', namely, *The Distressed Mind.* Even more so we need that knowledge if we are to help our people 'to grow up into the stature of a man in Christ

Jesus' or in the words of St. Paul to become "more than conquerors through Him that loved us". Let us as ministers remember that although the psychologist may be able to evaporate a 'complex' he cannot change character; that is the work of the Gospel; he may be able by analysis to show an individual to himself; it does not follow that the individual automatically becomes a different self. The that the individual automatically becomes a different self. The work of psychotherapy always needs the work of God for its completion.

The Rev. Leslie J. Tizard's *Guide to Marriage* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is the only book I know which covers in a single small volume the many concerns of married life—sex, money, friendships, religion, and even furniture! Most school children nowadays are given some sort of information about the physical facts of sex, but often with no sort of background other than biology. Mr. Tizard gives the facts with lucid frankness, but in a Christian setting and with friendly good humour. He might with advantage have strengthened the section on religion, even for the doctrinally uninstructed whom he rightly keeps in view, but he gives us much wisdom about many of the issues of life, and there can be few people who would not receive help from his words. I wish this *Guide* could be available to every couple who apply to be married in Church, and I confidently commend it to ministers and leaders of youth. E. C. D. STANFORD.

Sublimation, by Dr. J. Trevor Davies (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), is a competent defence of a psychology that, unlike Freudianism, accepts the naturalness of higher expressions of human nature than pure instinct. But one may question whether this is best done by stretching the term Sublimation to include not only unconscious deflection of repressed instinct into higher channels but also conscious choice for their own sake of higher activities. It is confusing to call different things by the same name.

The religion that is sublimated sex or agression is discernibly morbid and unhealthy. It calls for analysis and is no basis for the explanation of our higher life. Freud used it thus because he did not believe that altruism had genuine roots in human nature. There is a difference in motivation and quality between higher activities entered on as a disguised outlet for repressed instinct (sublimation proper) and those activities entered on for their own sake.

Dr. Davies writes: "partly religion is the result of the sublimation of several instincts". If, then, these instincts were fully satisfied, religion would lose something essential. He quotes with approval Dr. Unwin's astonishing statement: "No social energy can be displayed unless the sexual opportunity is limited". That is the Freudian view that there would be no cultural life apart from instinctual frustration. The author is too tied to instinct theory, and seems not to have taken account of the far-reaching modifications demanded by the work of E. Fromm, Karen Horney and others.

Stammering by Kate Emil-Behnke (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) declares that stammering is curable at any age. It is a nervous disorder due to fear and shock to the sympathetic Nervous System, which sets up wrong habits of breathing, and lack of co-ordination between breathing and speech. Psycho-therapy may deal with the fear, but physical re-education is usually needed to correct the use of the speech mechanisms. H. J. GUNTRIP.

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)

Revelation and Response in the Old Testament. By C. A. Simpson. Columbia University Press; London: Cumberlege. 14s.

The purpose of this careful and scholarly book is to show how Israel interpreted the events of history "in the light of the consequences that followed upon the human response to the divine action". The first chapter deals with primitive Yahwism, in which, in the author's view, monotheism was already implicit. The conception of Yahweh was enriched by absorption of the religion of Kadesh, and Moses' work (chapter two) was to elicit the creative response to the salvation at the Red Sea. Yahweh, as a God of righteousness, hated oppression: the rescued must do likewise. But Moses was a priest at Kadesh, and was never in Egypt, while the bondage was a relatively small affair. In the third chapter we are told how Yahweh next adopted the religion of the Hebron sanctuary, and with it Abraham, who now became the ancestor of the Israelites. Thus the desert origin of Abraham as the father of nomadic Israel was a later construction. In the fourth chapter the rise of the monarchy is sketched, and in the next is brought out the importance of the J document as, in its final form, an attempt, by the inclusion of northern as well as southern traditions, to secure the spiritual unity of the nation which was endangered by the political disruption of the kingdom. The last two chapters review the work of Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. With certain other scholars the writer assigns the beginning of Jeremiah's ministry to 608 instead of 626. Thus the problem of the prophet's relation to the Deuteronomic reform does not arise, since he had not emerged as a prophet during Josiah's reign. This book, while always brilliant and sometimes original, is not invariably convincing; but it is of absorbing interest. The main theme is never silent for long. God acts, Israel responds. The consequences of the response teach the nation whether it was the right or the wrong one; and through experience Israel was finally to learn that it was called to a vocation of suffering. The recognition and acceptance of this would redeem the wilful past.

A. J. B. Higgins.

God was in Christ—An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. By D. M. Baillie, D.D. Faber. 16s.

The starting point of Professor Baillie's book is the recognition that a new situation in Christology has arisen in this century. On the one hand Conservatives and Liberals alike have finished with Docetism; Jesus is conceived by all as a true man in the fullest sense of the words. On the other hand the recent Form-Criticism has tended to shift the emphasis from the Jesus of history, the theme of the nineteenth century, to the Church's faith in Christ: it is even suggested that the historical Jesus is unknowable: we cannot go behind the Church's testimony, but must rest in that.

Dr. Baillie insists that the Jesus of history is indispensable and that He can be known; nevertheless, a merely humanistic vision of Jesus is inadequate. A high Christology is needed to explain how it is that only through Him does history receive its proper interpretation. The problem for our time is, therefore, to state a Christology which does justice to the new emphasis on the humanity of Jesus, and yet does not degenerate into mere humanism. Here none of the views now prevailing will help. The doctrine that the human nature of Christ was personalized through the Divine hypostasis gives us no real humanity. The doctrine of Kenosis does so; but

it leaves us with insuperable difficulties as to the activity of the Logos during the period of Kenosis. Finally, to say that Jesus is Leader and Lord does not sufficiently recognize the transcendent element in Him.

Professor Baillie accepts from Kierkegaard the principle that faith in the Incarnation can only be stated as a paradox. But that is nothing against it, since Christian faith is full of paradoxes. Creation out of nothing is paradoxical; so also is the doctrine of Providence, according to which all things work together for good to those that love God. There is, moreover, a third paradox, which leads us right up to the very threshold of the doctrine of the Incarnation. This is the paradox of grace, according to which man is morally free only in absolute dependence upon God. Jesus may then be construed as a miracle of grace, rising out of the midst of humanity, and living a life of perfect freedom in dependence upon God.

This miracle requires explanation; along with it must be taken the experience that Jesus continues to be present in the Church through the Holy Spirit, who is at once the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. The doctrine of the Trinity is the Church's explanation of these things, but what does it mean? Theology today wavers between a modalism, represented by Barth, and a doctrine of the Social Trinity, now dominant in Anglican theology. Dr. Baillie finds both views inadequate; but if they are taken together, they may point to a mystery beyond either of them. Through the Trinity of Revelation we may catch a glimpse of the immanent Trinity of the Divine life, which is a mystery transcending human ken where thought loses itself in antinomies.

We return, therefore, from the vision of the Ineffable to the more familiar ground of the sphere of Revelation, and ask how the Incarnation explains itself through the Atonement. Not that, with Ritschl, we are to make our Christology simply a value-judgment on what has been done for us; yet, as Anselm says, it is only the Atonement that gives the answer to the question, *Cur Deus Homo?* But how is the Atonement itself to be understood? Professor Baillie sees it as the introduction into history of the power of the Divine forgiveness, which deals with and overcomes human sin. The origin of sin may be a mystery, expressible only in terms of myth; but every one of us shares in the original sin of the race in so far as we are born into, and are infected by, a sinful environment.

In the Atonement, then, is the relevance of the Incarnation to our condition. It proceeds from a Divine love, which bears the burden of human sin, just in forgiving it. The Divine suffering for sin is manifested at a point in time, when Jesus was crucified; but it is not restricted to this point only. The Cross is eternal in the heart of God. Not only in time but in eternity God suffers for human sin.

Such is a bare outline of Dr. Baillie's work: some attempt at appreciation must now follow. His theology may be said to belong to the right-wing of the school of Schleiermacher, and as a return to the lines of that great theologian, it is to be warmly welcomed in these days when, very unjustly, he is supposed to be outmoded. The agreement with Schleiermacher on important points is striking. Original sin is explained exactly as Schleiermacher explains it; and, above all, Christ Himself is explained as the Man in whom dependence upon God is perfectly realized. The principal difference from Schleiermacher is that Dr. Baillie tends to use Biblical language where Schleiermacher uses philosophical terminology; but the fundamental outline discernible through the Biblical phraseology is closely akin to that of the *Glaubenslehre*.

Yet Dr. Baillie's Schleiermacherianism is Schleiermacherianism of the right. This comes out in his insistence on the Personality of God and on

the doctrine of Creation out of nothing; whereas Schleiermacher treats the question of Theism or Pantheism as an open alternative. It is to be observed, however, that Dr. Baillie does approach Schleiermacher even in the doctrine of God, when he alternates between a Modal and a Social Trinity.

There is one point, certainly, where in a disputable concession to modern feeling, Dr. Baillie moves very far away from Schleiermacher: that is in accepting the doctrine of the Divine passibility. But even here he mediates: he says that if there is suffering for human sin in the life of God, it is eternally swallowed up in victory and blessedness.

To sum up, Professor Baillie is finely inspired by the spirit of the great *Vermittler*. His theology is irenic—everywhere he seeks the golden mean, he seems to say to us, *medio tutissimus ibis*. There is no doubt as to the great value of his work. If it is easy to read, that is because of its lucidity. It furnishes an exhaustive guide to the theology of the Incarnation in this century. The construction is at once solid and attractive. A proper appreciation of the work in the detail it deserves would go beyond the limits of a review, and would require a whole book on the subject. Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to my Dale Lectures, *The Atonement* (Oxford, 1934), where I have set out views partly coincident with, and partly differing from, those of Professor Baillie. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The History of the Primitive Church. By JULES LEBRETON, S.J., and JACQUES ZEILLER. Translated from the French by ERNEST C. MESSENGER, Ph.D. Burns, Oates. 25s.

This volume completes an 1152-page history of the Church of the first three centuries, and comprises pp. 761 to 1152 of the whole work. The present review is restricted to vol. IV, the previous volume having been reviewed by the late Dr. C. J. Cadoux in the *Congregational Quarterly* of April 1947.

Vol. IV deals with the history of the Church from about the middle of the third century until the Peace of Constantine in 312. The treatment is to a great extent biographical and topical. Thus a 66-page chapter is devoted to Origen, and other great figures receive similar special treatment, though not on the same scale: there are sections on Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paul of Samosata, Lucian of Antioch, Methodius, and some others. These biographies are very well done, that on Origen being particularly excellent. Other special sections deal with such topics as particular doctrines, heresies, worship, orders, apocryphal literature. This method of treatment has advantages and disadvantages. The book could hardly be recommended as a first approach to Church History; but to anyone more or less familiar with the ground it provides a most excellent supplement and book of reference. The matter is well selected, factually presented and adequately documented. For the student it would provide a useful supplement to a work such as B. J. Kidd's *History of the Church*, while the general reader would find profit in the various sections, especially those in his own line of interest.

The authors are Roman Catholics, but the volume is entirely free from bias. It is the work of completely honest historians, and there is really no need even to tell the reader to keep it in the back of his mind that the work is written from the Roman Catholic point of view. Even in the chapter dealing with the papacy there is little to criticize. All is fairly stated, and contrary authorities and opinions are quoted when relevant. The work of translation has been excellently done: it does not read like a translation. So far as I have checked them, the quotations and references are exact, and there is hardly a misprint. This is a work of real value, which I commend to students and serious readers. AUBREY R. VINE.

The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More. Edited by ELIZABETH FRANCES ROGERS. Princeton University Press. London: Cumberlege. 42s.

Sir Thomas More, like other men of his time, was many-sided. There is the man of learning; the "Oxford Reformer"; the controversialist; the political ambassador; the Lord Chancellor; the martyr for conscience' sake; and the merry, saintly human being. All these are represented in his correspondence, which for the first time is here collected in one volume. Among his correspondents are scholars like Erasmus and Sinapius; controversialists like Bugenhagen, Frith and Cochlaeus; politicians like Wolsey and Cromwell; and More's daughter, Margaret Roper. Official political documents signed by More (often from the seriously damaged Cottonian MSS.) are included; so are epistles addressed to More at the beginning of published works. The whole collection numbers 218 letters, of which those between More and the University of Oxford, of which he was High Steward, have not been printed before. Letters in Latin or French are not translated. Correspondence with Erasmus is merely calendared, with references to P. S. Allen's edition of Erasmus' letters.

Allen's work is used, very naturally, as a *vade mecum* throughout. This inevitably rouses thoughts of comparison in editorial method, which are not in Dr. Rogers' favour. Her biographical and historical notes are often inconsistent in details, and sometimes inaccurate. The most unfortunate blunder is the inclusion of a letter from Erasmus (No. 193) which was not to More at all but to Desideratus Morellus. The greatest pains have been taken, however, to produce a correct text, and students of the religion and culture of the years 1515-1535 owe Dr. Rogers a great debt for very many years' devoted work. The volume is well printed, and carries four portraits and a facsimile of one of More's letters.

"I thanke our Lorde I knowe no person lyuing that I wolde had one philippe [*i.e.*, fillip] for my sake": "the clearnesse of my conscience hath made mine hearte hoppe for ioy": "take no thought for me what so euer you shal happe to heare, but be mery in God". When all is said, it is More's best-known letters, the letters from the Tower, which still make the best reading. A collection of these published in 1924, *The Last Letters of Blessed Thomas More*, is still obtainable from the Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15; its text is unreliable (*e.g.*, More's reference to the Nun of Kent as "that wykked woman" is emended to "the nun"), but its price is only 5s.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Political Theory of the Huguenots of the Dispersion—with special reference to the thought and influence of Pierre Jurieu. By GUY HOWARD DODGE. Columbia University Press. London: Cumberlege. 20s.

The purpose of this very learned and exhaustive study of the political thought of the exiled Huguenots is to show how far it acted as an intermediary between the politics of the Absolute Monarchy of the *ancien régime* and those of the French Revolution. The work is essentially a monograph on Jurieu, first Professor in Sedan, and then in exile pastor and Professor in Rotterdam. He is taken as the outstanding example of Huguenot thought in its endeavour to face the situation in which the exiles found themselves. Catholic antagonists and other Protestant controversialists with whom Jurieu disagreed are studied mainly to provide the necessary setting for the account of his thought. The net result of the whole may be summed up as follows:—

Recent research tends to find the direct ancestry of ideas leading to Rousseau and the French Revolution, not as was formerly held in the subjectivism of the Protestant Reformation, but rather in the very different

subjectivism of Locke, who was conditioned philosophically by Descartes, and theologically by Arminianism and therefore ultimately by Erasmus and the Renaissance. Locke, influenced by the Arminian Grotius, derived governmental authority from a social contract in which independent individuals hand over power to the government for the sake of the common wellbeing. The Reformers on the other hand, for all the subjectivity of their doctrine of justification by faith, stood firmly on the Scripture which says that the powers that be are ordained of God: thus they derived governmental authority from the Divine order of the creation, and not from a social contract made by individuals.

Nevertheless, there were elements in Protestant theology and practice which favoured revolutionary ideas in politics, at least by the atmosphere which they produced. These elements were particularly strong in Calvinism with its doctrine of individual election and its ultimate appeal to the people in spite of the oligarchical character both of its political and ecclesiastical conceptions. From the individualism of the elect and the appeal to popular judgment the transition to the more radical idea of the social contract might appear not too difficult; and the persecution of the Huguenots whose culminating points were the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Dragonnades and Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, compelled even orthodox Calvinists first in France and then in exile, to move more and more to the doctrine that the ultimate basis of sovereignty was in the people, who might indeed delegate power to rulers political or ecclesiastical, but had the right to reclaim it, if such power were tyrannically abused.

Yet it was hard for an orthodox Calvinist to take the final step to political liberalism such as that of Locke; and the manifold controversial writings of Jurieu abundantly illustrate the difficulty. He got as far as to hold that the authority of the people, delegated to its rulers political and ecclesiastical, could legitimately be exercised by the subordinate parts of such government in councils and synods, against the tyranny of a monarch who disregarded his duties in Church and State. He viewed the oligarchs as the natural embodiment of the people in their revolt against tyranny, but thought of the people corporately rather than as an aggregate of individuals. This was his main idea; but he twisted and turned in a long course of political controversy, now being moved by the orthodox Calvinist theory, now being compelled to emphasize more and more the notion of popular sovereignty. He never reached, or desired to reach, the thought of a purely secular contract as Locke conceived it, and as the French Revolution applied it.

Jurieu and the orthodox Huguenots were therefore not the spiritual ancestors of the Revolution in the sense that Locke was: it was the ideas of the latter and not those of the former that dominated French thought in the eighteenth century. But Jurieu and his friends helped towards the Revolution, in so far as they led Frenchmen to break with the belief in Absolute Monarchy, and to locate sovereignty somehow in the people.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Christian Apologetics. By ALAN RICHARDSON. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

The contemporary dangers of writing defences of the Christian faith are twofold: either in commending to compromise, or to proclaim the sheer "otherness" of revelation so that persuasion is impossible. Canon Alan Richardson successfully avoids both perils. While repudiating the Thomist distinction between nature and grace, natural theology and supernatural theology, by maintaining that all knowledge is of the grace of God, he admits a distinction between general and special revelation. The distinction is not in the mode of receiving revelation (as if there were a special organ for the

apprehension of revelation), but one necessitated by the unique historic character of the Christian religion as created by the saving acts of God made known by prophetic and apostolic testimony. Thus there is a recognition of God in other religions and in other departments of knowledge. Truth, whether it comes from the Cavendish Laboratory or the London School of Economics, is truth because God wills to reveal Himself through the reason and conscience of men. But such truth is distorted by the sinful consciences and enslaved wills of fallen humanity. The recognition of original sin is the Christian criticism of sociological and scientific rationalism; whilst the recognition of "original righteousness" is the refutation of sheer relativism, scepticism and pessimism. The necessity of revelation is expressed thus: "The whole of us, including our reason, must be justified by faith. Reason needs more than signposts along the road; it needs the light by which they can be read" (p. 248).

Three emphases demand special notice: humility and love are necessary propaedeutics to the knowledge of God, because faith is primarily an encounter with a Person, not a series of intellectual propositions; secondly, the assertion that all sciences are based upon a "faith-principle"—the question is not faith or non-faith as the rationalists suppose, but whether the "key-category" is adequate; and thirdly, Canon Richardson's use of the "enemies" of the Gospel as allies, as when the sociologist's emphasis on "social conditioning" and the psychologist's on the perversity of egotism are used as witnesses to the doctrine of original sin.

In view of the way in which the author keeps to the spirit of his Augustinian motto *Crede ut intelligas*, and his intellectual vigour in refutation of a multiplicity of attacks on the faith, this volume should be a ***vade mecum*** for many perplexed Christians. HORTON DAVIES.

The Church and the Churches. By K. L. CARRICK SMITH. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

This book is a sympathetic and well informed survey of the life and faith of the Roman, Anglican, and Free Churches, written to show in what things they agree, and the nature of some of their vital differences. Miss Carrick Smith has given time and study to her subject; her aim is to find the grounds of a true Christian unity. But she has no romantic notions of a uniformity embodied in one vast organization, subduing us all to a single pattern. "Much of the value of the churches", she says, "lies in their distinctive nature." Jesus Christ committed to His followers no criteria or articles which were to be the boundaries to their fellowship—"Nothing dividing is from Him. What He gave and gives is the Unity of the Spirit." The makers of gigantic frameworks of union will find little in these pages to encourage them. All this is to the good, and it will appeal to the consecrated common sense of the various Churches.

The first part of the book deals with differences of faith, such questions as sacraments, worship, and the nature of the ministry. Where divisions go so deep it is not easy to deal fully with them in so short a space, and these chapters lose something in that way. It is not merely a matter of where you put the accent, but that you are faced with profound and historical opposites of doctrine. The second part reviews the contrasted modes of life of the Churches; these chapters are illuminating and full of information. The account of "The Three Denominations" touches the main points, though what is said of Presbyterian trends to "authority" rather wakens the old Independency in me. In the Society of Friends Miss Carrick Smith appears to find much of the type of unity for which she is looking. This is a very good book, deeply Christian in its spirit; and although in several points it is incomplete—*e.g.*, in its discussion of the matter of "establishment", it does present persuasively the hope we have of a larger unity of the spirit amongst us all. A. T. S. JAMES.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

Mr. Arthur Porritt's *More and More of Memories* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is a book of reminiscences with light shining on nearly every page. Apart from the fund of good stories about all sorts of people, ministers, politicians, journalists, and Lancashire operatives, and the hosts of his friends here and in America, the book reveals unwittingly Porritt's own personality: a man versed in affairs, and at the same moment a man with vision in his soul. The brilliant sketch of S. A. Tipple, the Baptist preacher of Norwood, becomes as he writes it self-revealing of himself. For nearly twenty-five years I was in constant touch with Porritt, and I cannot but say affectionately of him that at heart this is the kind of man he was.

The first two chapters on his boyhood and early days in Warrington describe with a loving hand the old Puritan Nonconformist home; a type of home which is at the back of so much that is best in the Victorian age. And afterwards when Porritt's work took him far and wide among various people, he never lost the Lancashire touch, and the simpler virtues of his spiritual heritage. "I believe", he says, "that a truly good man whose Christianity radiates from his life is the very best Christian advocate."

Medieval Man and his Notions, by Canon F. Harrison, Chancellor and Librarian of York Minster (John Murray, 12s. 6d.) is a fascinating record of medieval man, his doings, his ideas and his ways of life. The period covered is from *c.* 800 to *c.* 1500. The wealth of information the book contains is drawn from original documents and sources, many of them in the York library. It is an age that has passed clean away, and yet it was a full and vivid life the man of that day lived. His education, his science such as it was, his history and geography are described here; and perhaps most interesting of all his love of play-acting and map making. The frontispiece is the famous Hereford map now in the library of Hereford Cathedral. Chancellor Harrison's writing is alive and his book is delightful, even if you rather shy at antiquities. He makes you feel that this man of an age of faith was wiser in his generation than our own inflated saga of modern progress gives him credit for. The book is well illustrated, and has a good index.

The Dean of Durham's *The Life Everlasting* (Blackwell, 7s. 6d.) goes over old ground. There is perhaps little that is new in it; but for all that, Dr. Alington's treatment of the question is helpful and speaks to our condition. The interpretation of eternal life as a quality of life which begins here and now in Christ, a life submissive in all things to the divine will, is sound New Testament exegesis. Much of what is said by the Dean is along the same lines as Dr. A. Nairne's *Life Eternal.*

The Rev. R. W. Stewart's *An Introduction to Jesus for the 20th Century* (Jas. Clarke, 6s.) argues that Christ took over and carried to its fulness the work of the Baptist, both in its missionary outlook and its universal spiritual appeal. Mr. Stewart seems to have to part with a great deal that is vital in Christian theology if he is to maintain this view in this precise form. There is careful work in this book, and also here and there some highly disconcerting freshness. One cannot rewrite the four Gospels now.

Saint Francis of Assisi, edited by Otto Karrer (Sheed & Ward, 15s.). This admirable edition of the Legends and Lands of the great medieval saint will be very welcome to all students and lovers of St. Francis. It contains the writings that are essential to a true understanding of St. Francis' life; with valuable notes and scholarly discussions of matters which are confused and difficult. The editor's Preface is simple and illuminating.

The volume includes St. Bonaventure's Life, which is one of the standard sources still; and of course the "Fioretti" or "Little Flowers". When you read again how St. Francis preached to the birds, or how he tamed the wolf, you feel there is something of the soul which our later centuries have lost. Perhaps Mr. Gandhi was a kind of Indian St. Francis.

The Rev. R. S. Meadowcroft's *Postlude to Scepticism* (Louisville: Cloister Press, $2.50) sets out to show that the type of scepticism which was so prevalent in the years between the two wars has had its day, and that the time has come for a recovery and renewal of faith. The author goes on to define the lines a fresh statement of faith must follow if it is to avail for the times. About the death of materialism one does not feel so sure; but about the need for a recovery of faith there can be no two opinions.

The Essentials of Liberal Judaism by the Rev. I. I. Mattuck, Rabbi of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue, London (Routledge, 8s. 6d.) is based on Confirmation lessons given for a number of years. But it widens out to cover the chief points in Liberal Jewish belief, and so will be of interest beyond the immediate circle of Judaism. Very interesting is the chapter on the mission of Israel. Liberal Judaism, says the author, puts considerable emphasis on the missionary idea in Judaism, which is a universal religion.

The Rev. D. S. Ching's *A plain account of Christian Experience* (Epworth Press, 3s.) is a simple and unpretentious account of religious experience. It has the ring of reality and will come home, I am sure, to many readers. Mr. Ching defines Christian experience as "what happens to me as a result of God's revelation of Himself in Christ." This strikes me as better than pages and pages of confused psychology. A. T. S. JAMES.

In *The Christ of Catholicism* (Longmans, 21s.) Dom Aelred Graham has written, from the Roman Catholic standpoint, a meditative study, combining devotion with theological exposition, rather than a defence, although it is also offered for the "sympathetic consideration" of those not "in peace and communion with the Apostolic See". The promising note of the introductory chapter is not sustained in those which follow, and the attempted synthesis between scriptural testimony and Catholic dogma is not convincing. How can it be, in view of doctrines with no scriptural warrant, like the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption? It is, therefore, curious to find the author (p. 307) accusing some writers of his own communion of being unscriptural in failing to add the qualification "on earth" to the claim that their Church is the kingdom of God. Nevertheless, here is a book worth the consideration of those who would try to understand the Roman Catholic position.

The theme of Dr. E. L. Allen's *Prophet and Nation* (Nisbet, 7s. 6d.) is the problem of the purpose of God and national policy which exercised the minds of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Second Isaiah. In opposition to the false prophets, who shared the popular identification of the two, these great reformers realized the non-existence of any real unity between God and the nation, and strove, often in the face of persecution, to resolve the tension between loyalty to God and patriotism. This could be done only by bringing national life and policy into conformity with the divine purpose. The relevance of all this to the present is obvious, but Dr. Allen leaves the reader to draw his own inferences. The most interesting chapters of this vividly written study are the last two. Herntrich's view is adopted that Ezekiel exercised his ministry in Jerusalem in Jeremiah's time, and that chapters 40-48 are from the hand of a disciple in Babylon, who edited the book in it final form. The Servant of the Songs in Second Isaiah is an ideal figure of a martyr-prophet, but is in a sense the prophet himself, as he contemplates his own bitter experience of persecution in his ministry.

Dr. P. S. Minear's *Eyes of Faith* (Lutterworth, 15s.) has as its sub-title "A Study in the Biblical Point of View". There are four parts: "The Angle of Vision", "The Focus of Vision", "The Horizons of Vision", and "Re-vision of Vision". The aim is to show how a fertile cause of the misunderstanding of the Bible is the modern un-Biblical perspective from which it is all too frequently viewed. While displaying ample evidence of wide reading, this book, it must be confessed, is tedious and far too long. What takes nearly 300 verbose pages to say could have been more digestibly compressed into a third of the space.

Dr. J. Jocz's *The Jews in the Bible* (S.P.C.K., 2s.) is the first of a proposed series of Bible study courses, primarily intended for Ruri-decanal study circles, but suitable for much wider use. The twelve sections consist of scripture readings, a consideration arising out of them, questions, and suggested model answers. The booklet can be recommended for older groups.

A. J. B. Higgins.

I cordially commend *Two Ways of Life: Christian and Materialist* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) by Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor, who is Curator of the Museum of the History of Science at Oxford. He writes attractively, and he makes us face the ultimate issue of our time: whether God is, and if so He must be taken seriously; or whether God is not, and if so His absence must be taken seriously. The fact that the Christianity Dr. Taylor presents is that of the Roman Catholic Church detracts little from the worth of the book for other Christians.

The Existence of God (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) is a Thomist essay by Dom Mark Pontifex, Monk of Downside. It expounds the philosophy of St. Thomas in modern language. This it does competently and interestingly. But it makes no attempt to relate the thinking of St. Thomas to the thinking of later centuries.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

A Kierkegaard Anthology, edited by Mr. Robert Bretall (Oxford University Press, 30s.), arranges chronologically a comprehensive selection of the Danish thinker's works. The excerpts are both substantial and representative, and delineate Kierkegaard's intellectual and spiritual development throughout the latter half of his life. In the English-speaking world Kierkegaard's literary and philosophical importance receives increasing recognition, and in allowing him to speak for himself, Mr. Bretall provides considerable evidence for the claims now made for Kierkegaard's wide range and penetrating depth of thought. A few biographical facts which help to elucidate the works are contained in brief introductions to the different books, but here, within the compass of one volume, Kierkegaard is excellently introduced to us by himself.

Conrad Bonifazi.

James Duckett was an Elizabethan Roman Catholic bookseller from Westmorland, who after more years in prison than out was hanged at Tyburn in 1601 and beatified in 1929. The family boasts that "never has any generation of it lacked a priest since the Reformation began", and there is still a Catholic bookseller of the name in the Strand. Little is known, however, of the martyr, and Mr. M. M. Merrick's *James Duckett: A Study of His Life and Times* (Douglas Organ, 15s.) has more to say of his times than of his life, and is less effective and attractive than other recent studies of this kind.

Thomas Story (1607-1742) has received less than his share of attention, for after George Fox's death he "was perhaps, next to his friend William Penn, the leading Friend of his generation"; and his *Song of Praise* is not

unworthy of comparison with Kit Smart's *Song to David*. In *Travelling with Thomas Story: The Life and Travels of an eighteenth-century Quaker* (Letchworth Printers Ltd., 15s.) Emily E. Moore has kept close, perhaps too close, to the 768 pages of his folio *Journal*, which describes his tireless itinerating as a preacher. The result is rambling in more than one sense. Prof. Rufus M. Jones commends the book, which is profusely illustrated and runs to over 300 pages.

It might be thought difficult to find unused material relating to Cardinal Newman, but at Magdalen College, Oxford, is a mass of MSS. collected by Newman's friend, the Rev. J. R. Bloxam, including several unpublished letters from Newman. These have been skilfully woven into a narrative entitled *Newman & Bloxam: an Oxford Friendship* by Rev. R. D. Middleton (Oxford Press, 18s.), which has the attraction of a fresh angle of vision. Newman's ingrained love of secrecy is very noticeable: phrases like *"in fact* (though *it must not be said*)", "but this is a secret", "which, *though a secret as yet,* is very probable", *"without mentioning my name"*, constantly recur; it is no wonder he was thought evasive.

"No monastery, no convent, no university, no school, no college, not even the Papal Guard can boast a similar pedigree straight back to the reign of King Stephen", claims Mr. Charles Grant in his popular *Story of St. Thomas's, 1106-1947* (Faber, 8s. 6d.). Florence Nightingale is naturally the centre-piece, and to her vision and its fulfilment half his book's pages are given. A century ago "Roman Catholic and Jewish ministers were allowed to attend when required, but dissenting ministers were excluded because they 'excited the patients' "! The book is exceptionally well illustrated, with eight plates in colour.

Sir David Ross has written the British Academy memoir of *Alfred Edward Taylor* (Cumberlege, 4s.). Though "one of the greatest scholars in the country", whom Samuel Alexander "described as the best-read man in these islands", and though one who "always spoke as if his own enthusiasm extended all over the literate earth", Taylor would insist that behind his own brilliant researches into Platonic philosophy "is only the impenetrable night".

The sedulously anonymous annual prefaces to *Crockford's Clerical Directory,* surveying the previous year's events in so far as these affect the Church of England, are noted for their "broad", Olympian character, sometimes humorous, often penetrating, always moderate. It was an excellent idea to gather together selections under the title *Crockford Prefaces: The Editor Looks Back* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.). They provide much material to interest Free Churchmen, though the Editor's sturdy Erastianism may sometimes raise a smile.

Few country towns possess so imposing a sight as the Castle seen from Castle Street, Farnham. In *Farnham Castle* (Farnham: Surrey & Hants News, 2s. 6d.) Major A. G. Wade ably describes the history and architecture of this noble pile.

Free Churchmen will welcome *The Ministry of the Church* (Canterbury Press, 2s.), in which the Rev. J. P. Hickinbotham, Prof. S. L. Greenslade, the Rev. C. F. D. Moule, Prof. F. W. Dillistone and the Rev. F. J. Taylor reprint articles from *The Record* in careful criticism of *The Apostolic Ministry* from an Evangelical position. Bishop Stephen Neill introduces the subject with "A General Survey". The writers' position is that episcopacy is desirable, but that its absence does not "unchurch" other systems.

Their case is strengthened by Professor Norman Sykes' "Essay towards a historical interpretation of the Anglican tradition from Whitgift to Wake", *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the 16th and 17th*

Centuries (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.). "It is in this combination of a positive affirmation of the value of episcopacy, and of a refusal to assert for it an exclusive claim that the *differentia* of the Anglican tradition consists".

The increased interest in Parliamentary activity and the reputed high attendance of members of the Commons are curiously offset by the Government's appearance of contempt for Parliamentary procedure and traditions. The late Lord Hemingford did a public service in providing a clear and succinct description of *What Parliament Is and Does* (Cambridge Press, 6s.). Chapter-headings include "The Way in which Parliament Works" and "Points of Parliamentary Procedure".

David Cox (15s.) is the first of a series of "British Painters" from Phoenix House, in which a feature is the number of fine reproductions in monochrome. The author, Mr. Trenchard Cox, is Director of the City Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham, the city where David Cox was born in 1775 and died in 1859, and where the most important collection of Cox's work is to be found. He likens Cox to Trollope in his absence of "temperament" and in his liking for a set routine. Studies of Blake, Constable, Gainsborough and Turner are in preparation.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Foster Home and the Boarded Out Child (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), by Miss D. M. Dyson, Chief Executive Officer, Boarding Out, of Dr. Barnardo's Homes, is a wise and comprehensive guide to foster-home care, which will be of assistance principally to those who are in close touch with actual or potential foster-homes. It should be read by ministers and other people whose work is of a pastoral or advisory nature.

The Rev. F. H. Hilliard's *Man in the Eastern Religions* (Epworth Press, 5s.) is a knowledgeable survey of the subject, and an assessment of what truths the great religions of the East have to teach, and learn from, Christianity. The final chapter gives brief consideration to the adjustments necessary in the teaching work of foreign missions if a comparative viewing of truth is pursued. Study circles should find this a valuable textbook—the more so because of the author's clarity of thought and expression.

Robert Gray (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), by Mrs. Audrey Brooke, is the life story of the first Bishop of Cape Town. Consecrated in 1847, Bishop Gray devoted the remainder of his life—twenty-five years—to the Church in South Africa, and the extension and consolidation he fostered are a lasting memorial to his zeal and greatness. It seems to have been his lot in life to be involved in problems and controversies, most notably the unfortunate Colenso controversy. The two photographs reproduced, the first showing "The Bishop before leaving England", and the other, "The worn out Metropolitan", bear poignant evidence of what his work and difficulties cost him. Mrs. Brooke has written an interesting and convincing life of a devoted and fine Christian.

Miss Elizabeth Pack's *My Own Bible: A Child's Old Testament* (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.) meets a real need. It relates clearly and in simple language many of the Old Testament stories, and in the probable order in which they happened. Boys and girls should find this a useful companion to the Bible which will give them a clear idea of the story and message of the Old Testament. There are eleven coloured illustrations, the printing is clear and the book is quite strongly bound. It could, however, be given a better title.

Pilgrimage to Amsterdam (S.C.M. Press, 3s.), by Canon H. G. G. Herklots, is a popular account of the origins and purpose of the World Council of Churches, and the themes for consideration at the first Assembly

in 1948. It should be noted as valuable for putting into the hands of enquirers and as a basis for a series of addresses at a weeknight meeting.

The Rev. B. T. Page has a great story to record in *The Harvest of Good Hope* (S.P.C.K., 12s.), an account of the efforts and achievements of the [Anglican] Church of the Province of South Africa in the past hundred years. "Heaven forbid", said the late Bishop of St. Albans, when Archdeacon of Johannesburg, "that we should ever come to look upon the Church of Christ as a business to be run . . . we must see to it that the Church . . . is a spiritual force". It is as a spiritual force that we witness the Church pioneering and triumphing through consecrated men and women in South Africa. Mr. Page has written a painstaking and objective history for the general reader.

Strong Tower (China Inland Mission, 9s. 6d.) by Dr. A. J. Broomhall is a description of life and the Christian Church among the Nosu, who dwell in the Great Cold Mountains in remote Kwejchow Province. But it is much more than that. The principal character is "Mr. Peace", a Nosu who has maintained his early Christian allegiance. The story of the Christian leadership he has had to give, the paganism that surrounds him, the difficulties within the church at Kiehkow, and the personal hardships he has borne with Christian fortitude will move the reader to humble admiration for Mr. Peace's godliness and sterling character. Dr. Broomhall has put facts into story form. He has natural gifts of description and narration. This is a fine and memorable book.

The Rev. G. W. Byrt's *John Clifford: A fighting Free Churchman* (Kingsgate Press, 6s.) is more an appreciation than a critical estimate of Dr. Clifford. It is good to have the life story of this great man available in this comprehensive and very readable form. HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

Mr. Elton Trueblood has edited *Doctor Johnson's Prayers* (S.C.M. Press, 6s.), separating them from the scraps of journal and other impertinent matter included in the original, posthumously published *Prayers and Meditations*. By classifying the Prayers chronologically and according to eight major categories (e.g. "Work and Study", "Family and Friends", "Birthdays"), and by adding an introductory essay on Johnson's attitude to religion, he has made a simple but impressive little book.

Disraeli once told Matthew Arnold that he was "the only living Englishman who had become a classic in his own lifetime". Certainly his fame, unlike that of some greater men, has not been subject to ups and downs. His influence has been confined perhaps, but it has been continuous. Sir E. K. Chambers in *Matthew Arnold: A Study* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.) has assembled the facts of the poet's life in chapters which, in their accuracy and impartiality, suggest an extended *D.N.B.* notice, and has described in some detail his contributions to poetry, criticism, ethics and politics. Though the text runs to only 134 pages, the book contains an exhaustive classified index, a model of its kind. *O si sic omnes!*

Mr. F. L. Lucas' excellent *Tennyson: Poetry and Prose* (Oxford Press, 5s.) contains, besides an introduction and notes by the editor, a judicious selection of poems, a biographical note, a portrait, estimates of Tennyson by distinguished critics past and present, and, the more valuable because the less accessible, extracts from contemporary reviews of his work. The poet's own critical opinions are given in extracts from the *Memoir* of Tennyson by his son. To anyone who knows his poems well, but is less familiar with his prose, this may well prove to be the most interesting section of the book.

In *Alice Meynell: Prose and Poetry* (Cape, 15s.) various hands have

contributed to the making of a centenary volume, the word for which, as for the writer it celebrates, is "distinguished". In her introduction, biographical and critical, Miss V. Sackville-West raises the question of the relative value of Mrs. Meynell's contributions to poetry and to criticism. Unmistakeably a woman in her poems, her prose is, at its best—for example, in the short essay on Shakespeare, "Superfluous Kings"—in the great tradition, a halfway house, as it were, between De Quincey and Yeats. It is the more surprising that, though everyone knows a handful of her poems, these essays, remarkable for their perspicuity as for their style, are practically unknown. This anthology is therefore specially welcome. The three portraits prove that Alice Meynell's distinction was not of the intellect alone.

A Journal by Thos. Hughes (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) kept, between 1778 and 1789, "for His amusement, and Designed only for His Perusal", has been edited, with an introduction and notes, by Mr. E. A. Benians, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. The diarist, who left Eton at the age of fifteen and enlisted in the 53rd Regiment, saw two spells of service in Canada separated by a period on leave in England and France, and was for four years in America as a prisoner on parole. In 1790 he died of consumption at the early age of thirty. His diary, charmingly direct in style, and without literary pretensions, throws much light on social and military life in the American colonies in the later eighteenth century.

Miss Christina Hole follows her studies of English legend and folklore with a general survey of the facts in *English Home Life*, 1500-1800 (Batsford, 15s.). A vast quantity of miscellaneous information, drawn from contemporary diaries, travels, memoirs and correspondence, as well as from such standard authorities as Lecky and Trevelyan, is here presented in very readable form. The Index, which includes such items as "Breakfast", "Pets", "Toothbrushes", makes this information readily accessible. There are special chapters on the part played by the Church in daily life. As this is a Batsford book, it should scarcely be necessary to comment on the number and excellence of the illustrations. P. A. SPALDING.

The volume of *Essays Presented to Charles Williams* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) was intended as a gift of friendship, but is become instead a memorial to a man remarkable for his scholarship, wit, imagination and friendship. The best recommendation is the list of contents: A Note on the Divine Comedy, by Miss Dorothy Sayers; On Fairy Stories, by Prof. J. R. R. Tolkien; On Stories, by Mr. C. S. Lewis; Poetic Diction and Legal Fiction, by Mr. A. O. Barfield; Marriage and Amour Courtois in 14th century England, by Father Gervase Mathews; and The Galleys of France, by Major W. H. Lewis.

Well worth the money are *Henry Fielding* by Miss Elizabeth Jenkins and *R. L. Stevenson* by Miss Lettice Cooper, in the English Novelist series. (Home and Van Thal, 6s. each). It is now popular to sneer at novels which have a good story, in which the reader is made to wonder, "What is going to happen next?" This is hard lines on Stevenson, and on Fielding who, both as a critic and creative writer asserted the necessity of plot, and in fact created the kind of plot which no writer since has achieved in equal complexity and close-knit perfection. Within this framework he peoples his imaginative world with the most robust, lively and natural men and women. R. L. S., physically weak, sensitive, the conscious artist, presents a considerable contrast. But though we think of him first as the master craftsman in form and style he was Tusitala too, the word-spinner, creating tales of men and women living and feeling, doing and suffering, people to whom things happened. It is notable perhaps that both are often at their best when their characters are "on the road".

Haworth is one of the best-known villages in the North—thanks to Charlotte and Emily; but it ought to be known too for one of Patrick Bronte's predecessors whose name, though now largely forgotten, was once a byword through the country. *Grimshaw of Haworth* (Canterbury Press, 6s.) by the Rev. G. G. Cragg, tells the story of this remarkable leader of the Evangelical Movement and faithful pastor of souls. It is a thrilling and rewarding study of the life and work and faith of this friend of the Wesleys, of Whitefield, Ingham and Newton, who within seven years increased the number of communicants at Haworth from seven to twelve thousand, and won their love and faith by his *market language* preaching. Mr. Cragg has used his sources well, and helps us to see both the man and the whole background of the Evangelical Movement and of 18th century life in this wild hill country.

An Innocent Grows Up (Dent, 9s.) is a portrait of childhood and youth against the background of late Victorian and Edwardian middle-class life in a small west-country town. Mr. Norman Hancock remembers well a happy boyhood, about which he has no startling or horrid disclosures to make. But it was by no means dull for him; nor is it for his readers.

Simon Peter (Mercury Press, 8s. 6d.) by Megan Glyn (Miss M. G. Parry) recounts in a series of neat sketches the simple annals of a country clergyman. He is a lovable person, charitable and faithful, and the outstanding incidents of his long life give us an admirable picture of ordinary life in the small Welsh village of Eilfaen. K. W. WADSWORTH.

Taking a microscope to the history of thought is an intriguing business, which acts as a wholesome corrective by making one more aware of the climate of contemporary thought. In *The Mother's Role in Childhood Education* (Yale Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 16s.) Anne L. Kuhn presents a close study of the thought of one generation of New Englanders on "fireside education". Even within the span of thirty years (1830-1860) there was perceptible movement towards child-study, as opposed to child-moulding. Physiology and phrenology were then the reigning sciences in education, as psychology and sociology are now. This is a scholarly and well-documented book, yet one would like more liberal quotation, to give insight into the methods employed. Might we not have excerpts, for instance, from *The Child's Book on Repentance,* or *Agnes, and the Key of her Little Coffin*?

In *Religion and Adolescent Character* (Lutterworth Press, 10s. 6d.) Mr. W. H. Backhouse discusses how the Christian Church may use the opportunities provided for religious instruction in secondary schools. The book summarizes much that has been written on the psychology of adolescence, and gives useful information on the most popular agreed syllabuses, on material available as teaching aids and the like. All this is helpful. But the material seems to have been fished up out of the author's various lecture courses—why is the purely psychological study to be found in chapters 2 and 7, with alien matter between? A more logical line of development would make a more satisfactory book.

Professor T. E. Jessop gives us, in *Evangelism and Education* (S.C.M., 6s.) the fruit of wide experience in the presentation of religion to adults, particularly in the education programmes of the Forces. His style is clear and pithy; his psychology phrased in non-technical language. He proceeds from a clear analysis of the problem to suggestions, as definite as can be looked for at this stage of development, of how we may get down to the work of Adult Education. The result is a book satisfying in form and helpful in its content.

Mr. H. C. Dent's *To Be a Teacher* (Univ. of London Press, 4s. 6d.)

deserves thoughtful consideration, even though it has all the raciness of light literature. It advocates radical changes in every aspect of education, not least in the selection and training of teachers, whose personality matters first, last and all the time. ("The *safe* teacher is a dreadful menace to the children in his class"). In the emergency training colleges Mr. Dent sees already the shape of good things to come. Though "a range of studies and activities wide as life itself" ("limited", one is relieved to find, "by the ages and capacities of the learners") is to be the children's programme, the emphasis is certainly on activity, and there is room for doubt whether more concentration and sound learning would not be of value as a preparation for life.

It would be a dull or self-satisfied teacher who could not find both stimulus and material in Mr. A. C. Toyne's *The Journey of Faith* (Wallington: Religious Education Press, 6s.). Affirming that the Bible is too difficult to be given to children as a text-book, Mr. Toyne uses it as a book of reference for systematic and graded teaching on Belief, Worship, Right Conduct and Membership of the Church. The course is intended for the middle forms of secondary schools, but is in part rather advanced for most of them. The Scriptural texts and passages for study include some of the richest and most profitable in the Bible, though the net is thrown wider to take in, e.g., Bunyan, G. B. Shaw and Winston Churchill. There is a dictionary of religious terms. It is not to be expected that any teacher would be in agreement throughout, and an edition which would subtract the introductory talks and the exercises; to form a separate teacher's handbook, would be of very great service. KATHLEEN L. CARRICK SMITH.

"Human stories" naturally have a widespread appeal, and those who like them will find *The Houses Behind* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) very much to their taste. The author, Miss Gwendolen Freeman, is a voluntary social worker who, as a collector of small savings, visited a small area for fifteen years. She gained the confidence of the people, observed their lives with sympathy and heard their stories. In her book she tells a plain tale in a convincing way. She does not grow sentimental nor moralize. When you have read the book you will feel that you have been given an authentic glimpse of life in the (to most people) unknown world of "the houses behind".

When an author confesses that he set out to write a book about a book concerning an experiment which he had never seen and did not expect to see before his work was published, a reader must be pardoned if he suspects that he has to do with a singularly uncritical mind. Mr. John Comerford in *Health the Unknown* (Hamish Hamilton, 7s. 6d.) intended to produce a popular version of *The Peckham Experiment—a Study of the Living Structure of Society,* which was published in 1943. Before his book came out the Peckham Health Centre had got going again after the war and he was able to see it for himself. His enthusiasm was increased, but a reader cannot escape the suspicion that nothing could be *quite* such an unqualified success as Mr. Comerford makes it out to be. But it is a very readable book about a significant social experiment, and, if the reader is sufficiently attracted to investigate it further and form his own judgment, Mr. Comerford will have achieved his purpose.

Pathfinder (Epworth Press, 2s.), by Miss Hilda Chamberlain provides in a three-act play an interesting study of the building up of a derelict village church under the vigorous leadership of a young minister whose brisk modern methods yield gratifying (and surprisingly speedy!) results. This play should give to many who present and hear it ideas and ideals which

might well prove a real enrichment to their Christian service.

Two charming Nativity plays from the Carey Press (9d. each): *A Shepherd Remembers*, by Mr. E. E. Yeomans and *A Good Shepherd*, by Mr. W. W. Bottoms, are very attractive in the simplicity of their settings and the sincerity of the writing, and both could be effectively produced in any church hall; while Miss Vera Arlett's *A Long Look Back* (Independent Press, 3s.) comprises a trio of one-act plays, competently written and of varied interest. KATHLEEN NESBITT.

In *Behind that Wall* (S.C.M. Press, 6s.) Prof. E. Allison Peers has given us a series of brief introductions to the works of the great Christian Mystics, masters of the interior life, the life lived "behind that wall". In addition to the Spanish Mystics, on which he is an authority, there are chapters on St. Augustine, Ruysbroeck, St. François de Sales, Henry Vaughan, Thomas Traherne and others. A feature of the book is its marked devotional spirit. This is particularly true of the introductory chapter. G. DUCKWORTH.

SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

The *"English Christianity Series"* (Religious Education Press, 2s. 6d. each), by Mr. R. W. Thomson, contain clear and interesting portraits of some of the persons who brought the Christian Gospel to England and helped to establish it here. *How Christianity Came to England* tells the story from Alban to Alfred; *How Christianity Grew in England* continues it to George Fox; and *How Christianity Spread in England* brings the story to the present day. Mr. Thomson includes the patron saints of Wales and Ireland, and some men whose contribution was to take the Gospel overseas. These booklets deserve to be widely used. They are attractively produced and serviceably bound.

Kings in Israel (R.E.P., 2s.) consists of four Bible plays (three of them full-length) written for senior boys by Mr. H. H. Tilley, Senior English Master at the Technical Secondary School, Coventry. The characters of Saul, David and Ahab are powerfully portrayed and the atmosphere of the Bible narratives maintained.

In *The Man who didn't go to China* (Lutterworth Press, 4s.) Miss Jessie Powell ably tells the life story of Dr. Barnardo, in a manner which will appeal specially to older boys and girls.

In *Youth Club Technique* (Methuen, 4s.) Mr. S. G. Hedges surveys the types of Youth Clubs in existence, and then considers the principles on which they should be formed and the activities which may be pursued.

The first four pamphlets in a series to be published in preparation for the Third Jubilee of the Church Missionary Society, in 1949, are, *The Society in the Life of the Church*, by the Rev. Max Warren; *The Urgency of the Missionary Task*, by the Rev. A. J. Drewett; *Milestones in Missionary Co-operation—1* (to 1910), by Canon H. G. G. Herklots; and *Landmarks in C.M.S. History*, by the Rev. R. E. Doggett. It would be hard to find a better statement on the subject than Mr. Drewett's; and each of the pamphlets (Church Missionary Society, 6d. each) is informative, succinct and stimulating.

Brave New India (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.), by the Rev. H. L. Hurst, the first of the "Front Line Reports", is a useful, brief introduction to India, past and present, and to the life and function of the Church there.

There is a varied selection of well-told maritime missionary adventures in *Labrador to Savage Island* (Pickering, 3s. 6d.), by Mr. D. P. Thomson.

HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

"The value of history, especially just now, is precisely that it can enlarge our faculties of curiosity, understanding, and compassion and take us into the company of people whose experience eludes our categories." Thus Sir Maurice Powicke, in *Three Lectures* (Oxford Press, 5s.) containing his mellow reflections on "that closely knit matrix of Christian habitude in which most of us move". "The living past" is "always at hand to call us home . . . from the fugitive, the trivial, and the mean".

Another medievalist, Professor David Knowles, in his Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge, *The Prospects of Medieval Studies* (Cambridge Press, 1s. 6d.), praises

his subject as "a worthy and exacting pursuit", than which nothing but the Christian faith can so effectively provide mental armour "against the onset of illusion and chaos, against the use of the technique of civilization to destroy its substance".

A second volume of Edward Alleyn Lectures, those for 1944, has appeared under the title *Our Culture: its Christian Roots and Present Crisis* (S.P.C.K., 5s.). Prof. H. A. Hodges treats of its Thought, Mr. Christopher Dawson of Education, Miss Dorothy Sayers of Aesthetic, and Mr. Maurice Reckitt of Work; Dr. V. A. Demant opens and closes the volume, which he edits, with "The Aims and Assumptions of our Culture" and "Its Religion".

In the 1947 Raleigh Lecture, Prof. David Douglas writes on *The Rise of Normandy* (Cumberlege, 5s.). Pointing out that "within twenty years of the birth of William the Conqueror a Norman duke welcomed in his capital a pagan army from Scandinavia", he shows the importance of "the revival of a Church" in "the greatest period of Norman achievement".

Prof. Roberto Weiss' Inaugural Lecture at London is on *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy* (H. K. Lewis, 2s. 6d.). It reveals how much "humanism" existed before Petrarch, especially in legal circles, in various Italian cities.

"Spenser attempted the most comprehensive statement of the principles of what, till the other day, we could call our Western European civilization", and defined his purpose as "to fashion a gentleman". In the 1947 Warton Lecture on *The Faerie Queene* (Cumberlege, 3s. 6d.) Professor W. L. Renwick defends Spenser's "puritan sense of responsibility", which "demanded that delight in beauty should be justified by its spiritual value".

In *Shakespeare and the Termers* (Cumberlege, 2s. 6d.), the 1947 British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, Mr. G. M. Young approaches Shakespeare imaginatively from the side of the young men attending the Inns of Court in his day—"the Third University of England"—with surprising and exciting results.

Professor E. Allison Peers' *Cervantes in England* (Liverpool: Institute of Hispanic Studies, 1s. 6d.) honours the recent quarter-centenary with descriptions of the successive English translations of *Don Quijote*, which incidentally throw intriguing sidelights on the varying kinds of interest felt for "the noble spirit of the Castilian gentleman" (this is 1822).

In his Presidential Address to the English Association, *The Novels of George Meredith* (Cumberlege, 2s.), Sir Osbert Sitwell accepts Meredith's artificiality and "apparent improbability, from the viewpoint of the present" as an *advantage* in detaching the novels into existence "on their own plane, as works of art"; though "it would be incorrect if future generations were to conclude that Meredith's characters were untrue to life".

"The best the politician can do for the scientific investigator is to leave him alone"; but "the position of the technologist is entirely different": "the technologist must be considered as a public servant". In the 1947 Riddell Memorial Lectures, *Science and Politics* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.) Professor A. D. Ritchie indicates some of the challenges posed by collective organization to the principles underlying western democracy.

Sir Oliver Franks, in *The Experience of a University Teacher in the Civil Service* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.), found that "the reality of parliamentary control was an impressive fact": "it amounted to a continuous element of discipline on the minds of officials". This, however, "tends to exalt inaction over action".

The 1947 Burge Memorial Lecture was given by Mr. Robert Birley, who, in presenting *The German Problem and the Responsibility of Britain* (S.C.M., 1s.). considers the challenge as "one of the most startling ever presented to our nation". He calls upon the Churches to show to Britain "that Germany is, in the Christian sense of the term, a 'neighbour' ".

Sir Ernest Barker's *Reflections on Family Life* (National Council of Social Service, 1s. 6d.) are as wise and as much his own, as balanced and persuasive, as are all his reflections, and should be read widely by Christian parents.

The Genius of the Church of England (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) comprises two lectures: "Theology in the Church of England" by the Bishop of Derby, and "The Church of England in History and Today" by Canon Charles Smyth: the latter is both sprightly and fully annotated (at the back) and deserves a more permanent form.

Five Questions Before the Church (Canterbury Press, 3s. 6d.) presents the five sections of the Bishop of Rochester's Primary Visitation Charge, given from a strictly Evangelical point of view. It deals with Order in the Church ("Reservation has been the burning Church issue of my lifetime"), and with the Church in relation to Marriage, Worship, the Countryside, and Sunday Observance.

The Bishop of London's five Diocesan Adult Education Lent Lectures on *The Spirit of Church History* (Mowbray, 5s.) have their points, but are disfigured by deplorable prejudice and parochialism.

Altogether different in tone is Canon S. P. T. Prideaux's *The Making of Sermons* (Mowbrays, 3s. 6d.). Younger ministers and students in all the churches will profit gratefully from the wisdom and practical helpfulness overflowing in these lectures given at Salisbury Theological College.

"The dualism which runs through the thought of the Byzantine world" is the theme of Professor N. H. Baynes' *The Thought-World of East Rome* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.). It is traced in ethics, theology and asceticism, in political, scientific and philosophic thought, and in language: all in a spirit deeply informed but also tender and humorous, which often illustrates other "thought-worlds" by the way.

In *Science and Society in Ancient China* (Watts, 2s.), the 1947 Conway Memorial Lecture, Dr. Joseph Needham illustrates the dependence of the spiritual on the material from the relation of mystical theology (through the experimental sciences) to artisan labour; of feudalism to the level of military technology; and of slavery to the efficiency of animal harness. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Dr. D. O. Soper's *Practical Christianity Today* (Ken-Pax, 6s.) represents twenty-five broadcast talks and the addresses at five broadcast services. With the non-Christian mainly in view, Dr. Soper emphasizes, without any sneers at theology, the practicability of Christianity as a way of life, and manages to be forceful and relevant as well as interesting. Let parsons note the manner and agnostics the matter; and let theological students heed both!

Professor C. H. Dodd's *Benefits of His Passion* (Lutterworth Press, 1s. 3d.), six short Holy Week broadcasts, were rather hard listening, and can be more fully appreciated in the reading. In language that is modern and as simple as the subject permits the author presents profound thought on the profoundest of Christian themes. Biblical scholarship combined with religious insight and interpretative power. E. C. BLACKMAN.

On Reconciliation, by Mr. Victor Gollancz (Gollancz, 1s.), contains two lectures, one delivered to a British audience, the other to German civilians and prisoners of war. H. CUNLIFFE JONES.

NEW EDITIONS

W. Warde Fowler's first-class *Rome* in the "Home University Library" (Oxford Press, 5s.) has appeared in a second edition, brought up to date by Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, who has also revised the bibliography.

Henry James' *Portrait of a Lady* is now a "Double" in the "World's Classics" (Oxford Press, 7s.); Mr. Grahame Greene writes a brief introduction.

Miss Joyce Reason has brought the story of Mr. Basil Mathews' *The Ships of Peace* (Livingstone Press, 4s.) on to more recent days with tales of the *John Williams V* and a few details of the *John Williams VI*.

Hamlet by William Shakespeare (Vision Press, 8s. 6d.), illustrated by Mr. F. R. Johnson, has an introduction by Dr. Ernest Jones on *The Problem of Hamlet and the Oedipus Complex*. Hamlet is an obvious study for the psychologist, but it is doubtful whether his contribution increases the dramatic power of Shakespeare's play. The book is printed abroad and has a number of errors.

ALSO RECEIVED

My Testimony. Mary Warburton Booth. Pickering. 5s. A testimony, partly autobiographical, of the saving and sustaining power of Christ, by one who worked for many years among the women and girls of India.

Mongolian Plains and Japanese Prisons. D. G. Broughton. Pickering. 5s. A vivid, well-illustrated account of experiences in 1939-42.

Everybody's Psalm. Alfred Mathieson. Pickering. 2s. A thoughtful and devout exposition of Psalm 23.

Believing the Bible. A. D. Norris. Pickering. 5s. Proceeds from the assumption that to reject the Fundamentalist interpretation of the Bible is unbelief, and will hardly avail to persuade a critical enquirer either to believe or even to read the Bible.

Introductions to the Amended Lectionary. R. E. C. Houghton. Oxford Press. 2s. 6d. Notes intended for an Anglican committee of Convocation in 1944. Free Churchmen might use it with profit, and consider the advantage of a lectionary. A model of pertinent brevity.

From the Friends' Home Service Committee. *Friends' Way of Worship*. "The true basis is attentive and expectant waiting on God". *A Poet's Faith*. Rufus M. Jones. 1s. 3d. A study of Whittier, bringing out the "major influence" of

Horace Bushnell. *Our Beloved Dead.* William Littleboy. 6d. First published in 1917. Devotional universalism.

From the Lindsey Press. *God be in my Head.* John Ballantyne. 1s. *Consider the Lilies.* Charles M. Kelly. 6d.

Primary Education and the Art of Living. O. M. Wyatt. Rel. Educ. Press. 2s. 6d. A headmistress directs attention to the supreme importance of the foundations of the educational system.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (Jan.). On his retirement, tributes of rare quality are paid by representative men to the sustained achievement of Dr. L. P. Jacks in editing this journal since its foundation in 1902. Dr. W. R. Inge wonders whether a successful editorship of over forty years constitutes a record. He also contributes the outstanding article—"An Old Man Looks at the World"—which combines penetrating judgment and brilliant phrasing with more than a hint of characteristic sombreness. Dr. Ernst Fellner writes on "The Psychology of Socialism", and Prof. B. Phillips on "The Psychology of Irreligion". "Eclipse of Chalcedon" comes from the Rev. John Saunders, and "Should Christianity Count in International Relations?" from Prof. D. Mitrany. Prof. H. L. Stewart raises the question "Are Universities a 'War-Casualty'?" and answers it with an unequivocal affirmative.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Jan.). The first article comes from the Rev. L. D. Weatherhead, who writes characteristically about "Guilt, Psychology and Religion". Dr. Geddes MacGregor deals interestingly with "A Highland Heresy-Hunt", which culminated in the deposition of John M'Leod Campbell by the General Assembly in 1831. The Rev. T. Dring writes on F. D. Maurice in the spirit of Dr. Scott Lidgett's estimate of him as "the greatest prophet of the nineteenth century"; the Rev. N. Carr Sargant concludes his study of "Tomlinson of Mysore".

Review and Expositor (Oct.-Jan.). "The Importance of Literary Analysis in Old Testament Interpretation" by Prof. C. T. Francisco is complementary to "The Old Testament as Great Literature" by the Rev. S. L. Morgan, Sr. Prof. Wayne Oates contributes two articles which reflect the modern emphasis: (1) "A Christian Perspective of Social Change"; and (2) "The Role of Religion in the Psychoses". Prof. E. A. McDowell, in "The Problem of the Kingdom", concludes that there has been too great a readiness on the part of scholars to give the Kingdom an eschatological interpretation. Dr. Edwin Lewis continues his study of "Philosophy and the Fourth Gospel".

Expository Times (Nov.-Jan.). Prof. H. L. Stewart writes briefly but critically on "The Validity of Religious Experience"; he thinks the phrase unfortunate, because inexact, and stresses the theological need for an adequate substitute. In "Worship and the Child", the Rev. William Barclay assembles much obvious but useful matter relative to the effective conduct of children's services. The Bishop of Truro has two articles entitled "The Modern Re-Statement"; the argument follows a familiar development in which the value of a credal statement is emphasized. Prof. John Foster lengthily reviews Prof. K. S Latourette's *Advance Through Storm,* the final volume of *The Expansion of Christianity.* The Rev. O. T. Owen writes on "Jesus Christ, Natural and Supernatural"; and the Rev. A. J. Betteridge on "The Church and Christian Marriage Today".

Modern Churchman (Nov.). Apart from the Editorial, which has some well-considered things to say about the controversy between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Birmingham, this issue prints all the papers read at the Thirtieth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen, together with Sir Henry Self's Presidential Address and the Conference Sermon—"Imagination in Religion"—by the Rev. F. W. Moyle. With "Problems of Christian Faith and Practice" as its general theme, the Conference produced papers varying in interest and practical use. Among the contributors are Dr. H. D. A. Major, Canon Ian Ramsey and Dr. A. C. Bouquet. A Congregationalist, the Rev. T. Wigley asks "Can We be Religious Today?".

International Review of Missions (Jan.). Instead of the customary annual survey, there is a long and valuable report on the proceedings of the Committee of the International Missionary Council which met in Whitby, Ontario, last July. Its title—"Christian Witness in a Revolutionary World"—is sufficiently indicative of its contents. The Rev. Norman Goodall writes with lucidity and conviction about the present and future relationships of the I.M.C. and the World Council of Churches. There are useful articles on "The Inauguration of the Church of South India", on "The Presence of Protestantism in Latin America", and on the work of the Church in Fiji, the British West Indies and Siam.

Friends' Quarterly (Jan.). The primary article—"The Holy Spirit in Fellowship"—is an address by Lootfy Levonian given at Whitby, Ontario, last July. William Hubben writes on "An Existentialist Prophet" (Kafka); and in the light of her experience at Oslo, Elizabeth Braithwaite comments on "The Place of Young Friends in the World and the Church Today".

Evangelical Quarterly (Jan.). A Congregationalist, the Rev. John Baker, writes on the Incarnation and its popular interpretation during the last fifty years. In "A Forgotten Controversy" Dr. John Bowman deals with the one-time vital question of the divine inspiration of the vowel-points in the Hebrew Bible. Two contributions are of biographical interest: "Henry Francis Lyte, 1793-1847" by the Editor; and "Boston of Ettrick" by the Rev. A. G. Reekie.

Review of Religion (Nov.). In "The Theological Curriculum, the Christian and the World", Prof. G. W. Briggs pleads for the acquisition of a world mind by churches and theological schools. Other contributors are Prof. J. C. Archer and the late Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy. There are 58 pages of reviews.

Harvard Theological Review (Oct.). Prof. R. P. Casey is knowledgeable on "The Cultural Mission of Russian Orthodoxy"; he deals with both past history and present tasks. Of the two remaining articles—"Strata of Greek Religion in Aeschylus" and "Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus"—the former is strictly academic in content and scope.

Church Quarterly Review (Oct.-Dec.). The Rev. Geoffrey Soden continues his study of "Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester"; Prof. Leonard Hodgson writes on "Christian Citizenship: Some Reflections on St. Augustine, Ep. 138". Of historical interest are the articles on "The Papacy and the Diocese of Hereford, 1307-1377" and "Establishments of Archbishops in Europe".

Religion in Life (Winter). The Rev. L. D. Weatherhead deals frankly and constructively with "The Protestant Churches and the New World". Dr. T. F. Savage pleads for a return, not to traditional Calvinistic theology, but to Calvin's emphasis on God and man's relation to Him; Pastor André Trocmé asks "Is Europe Preparing for a Holy War?". The reconstruction programme of the Church, in so far as it is concerned with new buildings, invests with interest and urgency the articles on "Why I Prefer a Church with a Chancel" and "Why I Prefer the Pulpit Centered Church" by Dr. J. H. Powell, Jr., and Dr. H. M. Taylor respectively.

Presbyterian Register (Dec.). Deals mostly with domestic matters. Two articles have a wider appeal—"The 'Reformierte Bund' in Germany" by Pastor Robert Steiner, and "A Report from Austria" by the Rev. J. K. Egli.

Teachers of Today (Dec.-Feb.). The Rev. B. H. Reed advocates the use of "New Methods in Group Discussion"; a headmaster (Mr. E. J. Brandon) discusses his pupils' religion—or lack of it.

British Zone Review (Nov.). Two of the contributors are concerned with topics of great contemporary interest: (1) "Religion in Germany Today" by Mr. J. N. W. Gwynne; and (2) "What has Life to Offer Young Germans?" by a former Hitler Youth Leader. Both articles rebuke complacency and stress the need for friendship based on knowledge.

Yale Review (Winter). The American scene is portrayed by Prof. Jacob Viner in "Can We Check Inflation?", and by Senator Leverett Saltonstall in "A New England Republican Looks Ahead" (to success at the impending Presidential election). World affairs are dealt with by Prof. F. S. Dunn in "Peace Strategies in an Unstable World"; Prof. C. W. Vogel describes Britain's economic struggles for survival.

H. Cunliffe Jones.

Attention may be drawn to a special number of the Louvain Jesuit periodical, *Nouvelle Revue Théoligique,* published last June, which is devoted to preaching and preachers and which includes articles on the preaching of the Apostles, of St. Augustine and of the Middle Ages. Newman as preacher is studied in the Sept.-Oct. number, which also contains an article on Fénelon. In the April number Père E. Hambye presents reflections on the Roman Catholic clergy's resistance in the recent war. Père J. Duhr writes on "Le sens religieux dans l'architecture chrétienne" in the May and July-Aug. numbers. In the Jan. 1948 number Père J. Hamer presents the "Tension au sein de L'Anglicanisme" over Church Union in S. India.

The Swiss S.C.M. periodical, *In Extremis,* limited during 1947 to articles in German, has now ceased publication. During last year it was largely concerned with Communist tactics and strategy and with education. In the Dec. number Prof. H. Vogel published an address "Von der Verantwortung der Kirche für die Welt".

G. F. N.